

includes a
of melancholy
the expense of
Suakin.

Committee of the Indian
have now received
respondents in India,
(February 2nd) to the
with reference to the
important statements,
Indian observers on the
for the most part they agree
measures taken by the Govern-
locally as adequate, and that
aid to persons employed on relief
unduly low. With this view we
the statement of Renter's special
dated Raipur, February 2nd:—

food dole allowed by the famine Code is just
body and soul together and prevent death
sufficient to build the system up

correspondent at Ahmed-

the persons on relief is not quite satis-
Relief work consists of breaking stones
roads—work to which the majority of
relief are not used. The average rate of
pies—i.e. 7-64ths of a rupee.

measures mentioned in the Bombay Famine Relief
yet been taken. Poor-houses not yet opened in
affected. Weavers (a numerous class in the dis-
artisans are not given the proper form of relief.
work exacted is in excess of their ability; many
fore, earn the full amount."

of wages is considered too low. Men do not get
in consequence. Two things urgently needed:
rate of wages—the minimum to be 2 annas 6 pies;
reduction or remission of the revenue demand. Also
could be made for the preservation of cattle."

from Murshidabad (Bengal) states that
current rates of wages according to the
de are quite inadequate to save the lives of
working class." Similarly from Oudh we

paid to labourers on relief works are considered
as much as they do not supply labourers with
d. In poor-houses people do not get more than
food, while the ration in gaols for 'simple im-
prisoners is 22 ounces."

the report from Muzaffarpur (Bengal):

opinion in the district is that unless grain is im-
ported, or by some contractors under Govern-
ment, it is very difficult to save human lives. A large
number of the respectable castes require help in
obtaining relief and loans. They are prevented
from doing so by their special position from resorting to manual
labour. Food from the poor-houses shortly to be
distributed."

Palliating
the Symptoms.

MEANTIME public sympathy in the
United Kingdom has been thoroughly
aroused—nowhere, perhaps, more
thoroughly than in Lancashire, where the workers,
despite the considerable depression of trade which
the famine has caused, are contributing a regular
weekly subscription out of their wages to the Relief
Fund. But, while the efforts of charity cannot be
too strenuously put forth, it is all-important to
remember that their scope is limited to palliating
the symptoms. They do not, because they cannot,
touch the root of the disease. It is manifest,
however, that if Lord G. Hamilton has his way the
public will be left to the illusion that the symptoms
are the whole of the disease. We print elsewhere a
brief report of the recent meeting at St. James's
Hall, organised by the Social Democratic Federation,
where it will be seen that the most moderate of the
speakers was Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Lord G.
Hamilton has since sent a "reply" to the conten-
tions urged by Mr. Hyndman, whose public-spirited
efforts in bringing the true financial disorders of
British India to light have received, as they deserved,
the cordial gratitude of many Indians. Mr. Hynd-
man will have no difficulty in turning the "reply"
of the India Office inside out and upside down.
Nobody in his senses wishes to ruin the credit, or
destroy the railway system, of India. What is
wanted—as we have never ceased to urge in these
columns—is to mitigate the extreme poverty of the
mass of the Indian people by reforming, at all
necessary points, the system which has in a large
degree brought that poverty about. Lord G. Hamil-
ton told the Harrow boys a fortnight ago that the
present price of wheat in India was, curiously
enough, lower than the price in England. Appa-
rently he did not perceive that this remark was, in
the circumstances, a striking piece of testimony to
the poverty of the Indian people. The best friends of
British rule in India at this moment are those who
endeavour to go beyond official optimism, and probe
beneath the surface. We commend to the careful
attention of our readers the articles by Sir W.
Wedderburn M.P., and Mr. A. J. Wilson which are
printed in our present issue.

To the horrors of starvation in India

The Plague. have been added the horrors of the
plague. The Viceroy telegraphed to

the India Office on February 22nd that 843 deaths
from the plague in Bombay had been reported dur-
ing the week, and that 813 deaths from the same
cause had occurred during the previous week. Truly
it is impossible to magnify the afflictions under
which India is suffering at this moment. One of
our correspondents at Bombay writes on February
6th: "Our fair city of Bombay is in a sad plight,

living in the clutches of a dread disease which has almost devastated it. There is hardly a quarter of its vast population of nearly a million souls left in it, and that, too, is living in hourly dread of death. The mortality is scarcely below a thousand a week through the plague alone, and this has continued for the last twenty weeks, and heaven knows for how many more weeks it will continue. People have to leave their homes, and fly to various places, suffering many privations. The chief result of the exodus is the spread of the plague in various parts of the Presidency, many of whose towns have been largely infected, such as Karachi, Poona, &c. As to the real cause of this sudden visitation, we are as yet in the dark. But the general opinion is that, at first imported from Hong-Kong or Bagdad, the plague-germs have found a very congenial soil in the drains and sewers of Bombay. These have been found to be in a disgraceful state. Tons upon tons of dirt that had accumulated for ten or fifteen years, during which the drains had never once been opened to be cleansed, were taken out of them and allowed to lie for days in the streets. The panic is intense. Trade is at an end. Our several industries are denuded of hands, capital and labour having left the city in a fright which is not quite unjustifiable. What with the famine and the plague our part of the country is in a very pitiable condition. God help us! for the hand of man seems unable to do anything. Our sanitary science is helpless against the plague. Our immediate hope lies in the French doctor, Yersin; and the Russian doctor, Haffkine, is among us doing his best to stay the disease, but with little effect so far. A strange sight this—a Russian and a French doctor looked to for help by the second city in the British Empire! Cannot England send a Commission of her experts at this crisis to study the disease and save us?"

Judicial and Executive Duties. SIR CHARLES ELLIOTT has not gained much by his recent attack upon the proposal to separate judicial from executive duties in India. His perverse criticisms have simply had the effect of provoking a series of crushing replies, and not the least effective of them is the article which Mr. C. D. Field, formerly a Judge in the High Court of Calcutta, contributes to the current number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. Mr. Field limits his remarks to Lower Bengal (where it is proposed that an experiment should be made in the desired reform,) and at once places the demand on its true footing as the revival of a question exhaustively discussed thirty-five years ago. In other words, those whom Sir C. Elliott attacks merely ask that effect should be given to the conclusions of the Police Commission, and that the work begun in 1860 should now be completed. Sir Charles Elliott,

it must be remembered, asserted that the existing system was good in itself, and denied that it had produced hardship and injustice. But he supported his contentions by the simple process of ignoring the evidence on the other side. The cases collected by the late Mr. Manomohan Ghose were but typical instances of injustice which had occurred within the actual experience of an individual barrister. Sir Charles not only treated them as if they were the whole of the matter, but, as Mr. Field incisively shows, persistently overlooked the points which they undoubtedly illustrate. For example:—

"Dealing with the Jalmapore Mela Case, Sir Charles Elliott considers that the censure of the *then* Lieutenant-Governor did not impute to the District Magistrate any misuse of judicial power; and contends that the words of the Resolution—'In the opinion of the Lieutenant-Governor these proceedings involved a grave misuse of judicial authority'—were not intended to apply to the District Magistrate. The whole context shows that they were intended to apply. Sir Charles Elliott thinks that the censure of the Magistrate did not 'charge' him 'with any misconduct which he could not commit if the views of those who support the separation of his judicial from his executive functions were carried into effect.' But the conclusion of the Head of the Local Government who had to deal with the case was—'The whole case is a striking illustration of the danger and inconvenience of the union of executive and judicial functions in the same officer.' . . . It is clear to the Lieutenant-Governor that years of patient and careful working on proper lines can scarcely undo the mischief and remove the prejudice against the existing system produced by a simple case like the present."

Needless to say, Mr. Field refuses to concede with regard to the whole of India Sir C. Elliott's far-reaching postulate, that the keynote to success in administration is "the adoption of the Oriental view"—the concentration of all power in the hands of an individual representative of Government. In some provinces, it is true, British rule at first followed this pattern. But the "Oriental view" never existed in Lower Bengal, nor where it once existed has it remained stereotyped. Lower Bengal is a stranger to the "monotheistic incarnation" in which enthusiasts persuade themselves that the people believe. The precious theory is our old friend the "prestige" argument in a slightly altered dress. But, as Mr. Field puts it, there is a limit to the number of reins that can be grasped in a single hand—to the number of horses that can be driven by the best whip—and if this limit be disregarded, the safety of the coach will be endangered. Sir Charles Elliott thinks scorn of *homines unius libri*. Does he believe in a Jack-of-all-trades? He thinks, or at any rate declares, that the District Magistrate should retain his anomalous judicial powers in order that he may try political *causes célèbres* in which an Indian might be suspected of bias or weakness. But these, as Mr. Field well says, are the very last cases that should be taken up

by an official whose hands are full of other business, and whose want of daily familiarity with practice and procedure is likely to result in mistakes. Besides, in any practical scheme of separation, European magistrates would find a place. The District Magistrate is commended as a legal teacher. But what does he know about law? He is commended as a peripatetic inspector. But cannot—nay, does not—a Judge inspect? The financial objection, as Mr. Dutt and others have conclusively proved, is a myth. It is also a peculiarly shabby pretext in view of what Mr. Field calls the “mighty revenue flowing in from Court fees.” Mr. Field concludes in words that Sir Charles Elliott should find as clear as Mr. Ghose’s cases :—

“The statesman whose intellectual vision is not limited by the horizon of the system in which he had his first training, and who can see what progress demands, will not resist a concession to Native public opinion which is now feasible, which cannot be shown upon any solid grounds of argument to be inexpedient, and for the expediency of which the most cogent reasons have been advanced.”

MEMBERS of the House of Commons

“The Member for Anglo-India,” have during the past week been much interested in an Indian compilation, of which each of them has apparently received a copy, under the title “The Indian Political Estimate of Mr. Bhownaggee M.P., or the Bhownaggee Boom Exposed.” The volume, which is published at Bombay, contains some 272 pages of the “opinions of nearly the whole Indian press regarding the extraordinary attempt made by Mr. Bhownaggee to pose as the representative of the Indian people and to obtain from them a certificate of approval of his Indian politics.” Mr. Bhownaggee has brought this emphatic repudiation upon himself. When he first entered the House of Commons, there was a general disposition in India to hope that he would acquit himself creditably. We ourselves wrote in that sense, and the British Committee of the Indian National Congress made a friendly reference to him in their annual report. But Mr. Bhownaggee very soon made it quite impossible for self-respecting Indians, or Englishmen interested in the welfare of India, to countenance his tactics, and, on the occasion of his recent visit to India, his pretensions were greeted on every side with keen resentment. This compilation of press opinions will form a useful record of his discomfiture. By way of frontispiece it reproduces a striking cartoon from the *Hindi Punch*. It is rather a pity that the compilers were not also able to give the cartoon from our own *Punch* representing Mr. Bhownaggee—or Mr. Bow-the-Knee, as he is called in the House of Commons—“walking into” the Indian Parliamentary Committee. The caricature attracted a good deal of attention, and caused much amusement, among members of the

House of Commons. In this connexion it may be interesting to cite the remarks of the *Saturday Review* (January 30th) upon Mr. Bhownaggee’s intervention in the debate on Sir W. Wedderburn’s amendment to the Address :—

“Sir W. Wedderburn’s amendment to the Address on Tuesday respecting the condition of India brought the inevitable Mr. Bhownaggee to his feet. His stultent speech did not disappoint those who stayed to listen by any excellence of matter or manner. Mr. Bhownaggee is a fussy person, puffed up with ideas of his own great importance, but with no ability to support his pretentiousness. Like many of his fellow-Indians he has rather a brassy voice. . . . Sir William is popular on both sides of the House. He was formerly in the Bombay Civil Service. His brother, Sir David Wedderburn (from whom Sir William inherited the baronetcy,) was a member of the House of Commons some years ago.”

A WELL-INFORMED correspondent writes:

A Crisis in
Bhopal.

“Where is the member for India in these days? Why has he not put a question in the House, so as to enable the Government to throw some light upon what is going on in the Native State of Bhopal? Is it not the case that there is something like a crisis there to an industrious system of mis-government and oppression carried on under the nose of the English Resident for several years past? The Begum, being a *pardahmashin* princess, inevitably leaves the whole administration to her Prime Minister, Imtiaz Ali, formerly a native pleader at Lucknow, who is said to have filled every place of executive importance with his creatures from Oudh, to the number of somewhere about forty or fifty. The Begum herself is stated to be surrounded by ladies of his careful appointment. The natives are mainly Hindus, but they make no complaint against Imtiaz Ali’s myrmidons on the score of religion, for they have experienced good government from Muhammadans. What they do complain of is the gross oppression and maladministration to which they are subjected. Not a single man appointed by Imtiaz Ali has had any training under British officials in revenue or other administration, or has learnt experience elsewhere. The State treasury is empty. At the same time, Imtiaz Ali’s friends, who were poor men three or four years ago, are now said to be acquiring large properties in Oudh, while the Bhopal subjects are declared to be undergoing pillage, both under the forms of law and in defiance of law.

“THE strongest complaints,” our correspondent proceeds, “come from four Tehsils adjoining the northern part of the Central Provinces. They include ‘bribery, extortion, and illegal exactions.’ In a Memorial to the Viceroy, they congratulate themselves on their neighbourhood to British territory, which has enabled them ‘to leave the State without interference by the

officials.' 'There are', they add, 'about thirty other Tehsils in Bhopal, the people of which cannot come before a British Magistrate; their cases have not therefore reached your Excellency, but, if an open enquiry be made, they will all come forward to give similar evidence.' There now lies before me an abstract of over a hundred complaints submitted to the Governor-General's agent in Central India, all pointing in the same direction, and including allegations of extravagant rent-raising (*e.g.*, 100 per cent.), bribery, extortion, house-looting and false imprisonment, false charges, and grievous personal outrage (one of these being rape of a wife, followed by death). They are all sworn before a British magistrate. The Memorial mentioned contains this:

"But the greatest sources of dread are the new magistrates and the new police officials, who are under no fear of their superiors, and against whom complaints of serious offences have not been successful. They got up cases against people who complain against the officials, and effectually silence them."

"The most prominent men in four districts do not 'leave the State' for nothing. The Agent in Central India referred the complaints to the Resident. The Resident referred the internal administration questions, such as rent-raising, to the Darbar—that is, to Imtiaz Ali; and the cases of outrage he asked Imtiaz Ali to report upon! The complainants may well be excused if they decline to regard this preposterous formality as a just fulfilment of the Viceregal promise of enquiry. They ask an open enquiry before British magistrates on British territory and under British protection. They are obviously entitled to this. Why is justice denied to them? And what effects will a political ulcer of this nature cause, if it is not lanced to the very bottom?"

Another
Mutiny Novel. "A MAN of Honour," by H. C. Irwin (London: A. & C. Black), is not by any means a typical modern novel.

Its scenes are laid chiefly in India, but of Anglo-Indian society in the generally accepted sense of the term we have none. Neither does the author attempt acute psychological analysis. His characters do not stop to analyse themselves—perhaps in real life people did less of that in the 'fifties. Jim Purefoy, the last of an impoverished race of Irish gentlemen, determined after his father's death to become a soldier, though he had till then been reading at Oxford, where he met the friend, Inglewood, who is supposed to tell the story. This plan scarcely works well. After the first few chapters the story drops into an impersonal narrative, though it is still compiled from letters to Inglewood, and at the one point where he might well have come in again as an eye-witness of events of the greatest moment to his friend's happiness, he has nothing whatever to say. In brief, the main incidents of the story are these. Purefoy, while still a boy, had fallen in love with his cousin Margaret. Before leaving for India, where he had obtained a cadetship, he put his fate to the test, and found that his cousin did not return his affection. He confided in Inglewood only, and, almost hopeless at first, set out for India, where the idea gradually shaped itself of returning some day to reverse her decision. He had spent many years in India when his senior officer, and close friend, Mow-

bray, returned to England on leave. At Purefoy's request Mowbray sought out Inglewood, and visited with him the old home in Ireland. Here Mowbray met Margaret and married her. They returned to the lonely station, and Jim and Margaret were thrown into constant companionship. Too late, Margaret discovered that Purefoy was far more to her than her husband, and in an unguarded moment allowed Purefoy to see it. Jim determined that he must leave the regiment, when the Mutiny put an end to his anxiety by enforcing active service. Mowbray was mortally wounded in an attack on Delhi, and died, leaving his wife and boy to Jim's care. Then comes in the question of casuistry—how far are the wishes of a dead man to bind the actions of the living? Mowbray had expressed a hatred of second marriages. Purefoy had never ceased to love Margaret, he knew that she loved him, while she had never felt more than a friendly affection for her husband. Nevertheless, the survivor determined that he could not as a "man of honour" transgress his friend's wishes, and he decided that he could not marry Margaret. The question whether his fortitude would have remained unshaken is solved in rather an unsatisfactory manner. But perhaps death was the only possible way out of such an impossible position. The characters in the book are well drawn, but Margaret is disappointing. She does not develop as she promises at first. Love—unhappy, it is true—appears to convert her from a charming, if rather strong-willed, girl into a petulant woman. The events of the Mutiny have already furnished backgrounds for many books, but they are retold here with considerable vigour, and the regiment with whose doings we are chiefly concerned is one of the border regiments of Sikhs and Pathans which did such excellent work in that critical time.

Cash
in Hand.

ONE question of the hour is how much cash has the Government of India in hand? The amount of it held in India, both in the Treasuries and on deposit in the Presidency banks, is regularly published there, and may be found at least monthly in the Indian journals; though the press here takes no note thereof, not even the financial weeklies. As to the sterling amount of the Indian Government's cash balance here there does not seem to be any regular or authorised statement of the total held. That this has been very considerable during the last few months is evident from the frequent references in the City article of our dailies to the large sums that are, or have been, advanced to or withdrawn from the Money Market. For instance, in course of last month, one of these entries ran thus: "The Indian Council lent £200,000 fresh money at 1½ per cent. for about a fortnight, while in India itself money is so scarce that the Bank of Bombay has advanced its rate to 12 per cent." Since then there has been no distinct indication of any large sums being withdrawn; so that the India Office must have been doing good *soukar* business meanwhile; and so recently as the 17th ult., the remark appeared, "The Indian Council's broker lent a little (more) money to-day almost to the middle of March."

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

I.—THE STARVING RAYAT.

By SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

If in this country a pauper died in the work-house from starvation, we should at any rate hold an inquest on his body; and some one would be made responsible. The master of the work-house might prove that when the man had reached the stage of collapse, superhuman efforts were made to restore him; but this zeal on the part of the officials would not alone suffice to clear them from a charge of manslaughter. The questions asked would be, How did the man get into this state of collapse? What was his usual diet; and who was responsible for his being all skin and bone? Was a proper diagnosis ever made of his case; and were proper remedies applied before it was too late? Not only would such questions be asked, but those responsible would be compelled to give full and true answers. The master would not be allowed to stifle enquiry on the ground that the season was not convenient; nor would he be permitted to defy and ridicule his questioners, and to prance off, singing the praises of his subordinates, and of himself. If he would not be allowed to do this, why should this sort of thing be tolerated in those who are responsible for deaths from starvation in an Indian famine? I say to the Secretary of State for India, *Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur*; the difference being that in India it is not a question of one death from starvation, but of hundreds of thousands, and millions of deaths. Moreover, as regards the starving rayat, something worse than neglect is charged. The patient is now in a state of collapse, from chronic destitution and indebtedness, a ready prey to famine and pestilence; and I assert that it is the direct action of the Indian revenue authorities which has brought him into that state. The Government of India cannot plead ignorance; for I will show that it has had full warning, and that it has itself admitted the truth of the charge. Last month I told the story of Agricultural banks as a proposed remedy for the rayat's fatal indebtedness. The melancholy episode I have now to relate deals with the cause of that indebtedness. The money lender, no doubt, is the ultimate instrument of the rayat's destruction, but the originating cause of his ruin is to be found in the harsh, rigid, and unsuitable methods of revenue assessment and collection, which have paralysed his energies, and placed him a helpless victim in the hands of his creditors. How this has happened I will briefly set forth.

To understand the position we must bear in mind that, according to ancient Hindu custom, the claim

of the Government, on account of land revenue, is for a certain share of the gross produce of every field. Upon this point the ordinance of Manu is as follows: "The land revenue consists of a share of grain and of all other agricultural produce. Of grain $\frac{1}{4}$ th, $\frac{1}{3}$ th, or $\frac{1}{2}$ th, according to the soil and the labour necessary to cultivate it. This may also be raised in cases of emergency as far as $\frac{1}{2}$ th." Now this reasonable method, enjoined by the religious law and approved by immemorial custom, suited the people exactly; acting as a sliding scale; so that in a bad year the rayat had to give but little; if he had no crop he gave nothing; but in a bumper year the Government shared in the general prosperity, the rayat giving gladly out of his abundance. Under this system no harassing and untimely demand for cash ever came upon the rayat, because the claim of Government did not arise till the crop was reaped, and then all that the Government had to do was to take its share. Now, our great mistake consisted in breaking up this ancient customary arrangement, instead of developing and perfecting it. In place of this elastic method, which adapted the demand to the variations of the season, we have, for the sake of official convenience, placed upon the rayat all the risk of bad seasons, a financial burden which he is not able to bear. Instead of taking the revenue in kind according to the amount of the crop, we have fixed a rigid cash assessment on each field, and this amount must be paid punctually in cash on a certain day, whether the crop is good or bad. This method of fixing an average demand, to be levied in cash irrespective of the crop, may suit the case of capitalist farmers. But it has fairly broken the back of the rayat, who is a mere peasant living from hand to mouth. Also he cannot be brought to see the justice of making a demand upon him when he has not even food for himself and his family. He says, "In former days there were Rājās that were good, and others that were bad; the good ones took a small share of our crop, and the bad a large share; but Heaven never, before sent us a Sirkar (Government) which takes from us when we have no crop at all." In such matters popular sentiment is not a negligible quantity, and a wise Government will not only do justice but also be careful to convince the people that it is just. I remember well, in the early days of my service, a benevolent Collector trying to persuade a venerable village Patel of the advantages of a fixed average payment. But the old man replied by a parable. He said, "Oh Sahab, I will relate to you a story. A traveller coming to a river found a man sitting there, and asked him how deep the river was. The man replied, four feet deep, so the traveller proceeded to cross the river. It was true that the river was four feet deep on the average, but there was a deep hole in the middle, and into that hole

the traveller fell, and was drowned. Now if all we rayats go to the bottom in a bad year, what good will a moderate assessment do to us after that?" This is the native view of the case. But how did the innovation operate in practice? The rayat as a class possesses no cash. So the immediate effect was to drive him to the money lender, as a suppliant, in order to get the necessary rupees. And this was the beginning of sorrows. No doubt before this he had dealings with the money lender if he wanted cash to dig a well, or buy a pair of bullocks, or celebrate a marriage; but these borrowings were at his own time, and by his own free choice. In such transactions he could negotiate his loans on equal terms. But it altogether changed the relative position of debtor and creditor when the rayat was obliged, at all costs, to find a certain sum on a certain day. And in practice the new system proved more destructive than might at first sight appear; and this was so from three reasons, all of which tend to prostrate the rayat at the feet of the money lender. The first of these reasons is that under our smart official system extreme punctuality of payment is insisted on. The instalment must be paid on a certain fixed date, the result being that the rayats over the whole country side must find the cash on one and the same day. This of course immensely tightens the money-market and puts the local capitalist into a position to dictate his own terms. Secondly, the Government demands payment on a date when the crop is unripe and still upon the ground. This is done in order that the crop may be available for seizure in case payment is not punctually made. But of course the effect is to make the demand fall upon the rayat at the time when he is least able to meet it, when all his resources have been expended on his cultivation and maintenance, and before his crop is marketed. But the third aggravating circumstance is the most grievous of all, and that is the severity with which the revenue authorities deal with the defaulter: everything he possesses is liable to seizure and sale; his house and his land, his plough and his oxen, his bedding and his cooking utensils. And those who know how dearly the rayat loves his ancestral acres, will realize that to save them he will be ready to sign any bond that Shylock himself might feel inclined to place before him. It depends entirely upon the tender mercies of the money lender whether the interest charged is 25 per cent., or 50 per cent., or 100 per cent., or more. How is the rayat ever to pay back these debts? As a matter of fact he never will be able to do so. For when the crop is reaped all the rayats are alike anxious to sell; the market is glutted; and the village money lender, who is also the village grain dealer, takes over the crop at his own valuation, leaving to the rayat and his family

barely enough to keep body and soul together till next harvest. Thus year by year the debt swells with no prospect of repayment. It is evident that this state of affairs could not go on for ever. And in point of fact things came to a crisis in the Deccan districts of the Bombay Presidency, during my service, about the year 1875; when the money lenders refused to make further advances to their debtors, who already owed them far more than they could ever pay. What was the result? The revenue officers of Government were suddenly brought face to face with a very serious difficulty. Hitherto, however painful the process of finding the rupees had been to the rayat, it had all been as easy as shelling peas for the officials, as the mere threat of eviction sufficed to send the rayat to the money lender, and then the rupees were forthcoming. But now this source of supply had dried up, and the Government officers had to take action on their own account. Accordingly they proceeded to wholesale attachments of land; and hundreds of holdings were sold by auction, realizing only nominal prices. To give an idea of what went on, I may mention that in the Bhimthadi Taluka alone, of the Poona Collectorate, the number of defaulting rayats in 1873-4 was 4341, the amount due from them being Rs. 82,421. To realize this sum about 200,000 acres of land, assessed at Rs. 1,35,000 were sold by auction, yielding the paltry sum of Rs. 15,010, while Government bought in, at merely nominal prices, a large acreage for which no purchasers could be found. Looking to the attachment of the rayats to their ancestral land, it is not to be wondered that these proceedings excited the most bitter exasperation; but being unable to resist the Government, they turned their anger against their creditors. Agrarian disturbances broke out all over the districts; the money lenders were attacked in their houses; their bonds, decrees, and account books were burnt; and they themselves were driven out of the villages.

These disturbances were put down by military force, and a mixed Commission, known as the Deccan Riots Commission, was appointed to enquire into the facts and causes of the outbreak. This enquiry was conducted in a most business-like way, from village to village, the exact financial position of each rayat being ascertained, with the history and causes of his ruin. And I have no hesitation in saying that the five volumes of the Commissioners' report contain the most trustworthy record in existence regarding the rayat's economic condition. Their conclusions were in substance, First, that the rayat was driven to the money lender by the harsh and rigid enforcement of the Government revenue demand; and secondly, that once in the toils of the money lender the rayat's case was hopeless, owing to the irresistible weapons furnished to the creditor

by our Debt Courts. The Commissioners at the same time exploded certain time-honoured fallacies, such as the theory that the ruin of the rayat was caused by his extravagance in marriage and other ceremonies, the Commissioners reporting that for these purposes he did not spend more than was reasonable under the circumstances.

The report and recommendations of the Commissioners led in 1879 to legislation for the relief of the Deccan agriculturist, and a Bill for this purpose was introduced into the Viceroy's Council by the Honourable Mr. (now Sir Theodore) Hope. The debates on the Bill are very instructive reading. The conclusions of the Commission were accepted; but, unfortunately, the Bill dealt only with the sins of the money lender, leaving altogether untouched the more serious sins of the Revenue department. In justice to the Council it must however be stated that they did not seek to dissemble or cloak these sins. Even Mr. Hope, himself a Bombay Revenue officer, admitted in his opening speech that "to our revenue system, must in candour be ascribed some share in the indebtedness of the rayat." And the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab (Sir R. Egerton), who had a seat in the Legislative Council, spoke out very plainly, declaring his opinion that the peasant was driven into insolvency by the great stringency with which Government exacted their revenue as a fixed sum in cash at fixed times: "It seemed to him that too little attention had been paid to this cause, which must in a great degree have contributed to, if it did not entirely originate, the difficulties of the Deccan rayat." Mindful, doubtless, of the injunction in the parable, His Honour urged the revenue authorities to show the money-lender an example of moderation: "He thought it desirable that at the same time as measures of relief were afforded to the rayat from his private creditor, the Government, which appeared as a public creditor of the rayat, should also take measures to in some way lighten the pressure of its own demand." And he recommended that Government should so modify its revenue system as to take upon itself the risks of a scanty rainfall and a precarious crop, instead of placing all these risks on the rayat who had shown himself unfit to meet them. These views were concurred in by the other speakers, including the Viceroy (Lord Lytton). But, unfortunately, nothing whatever was done by the Relief Bill to relieve the rayat from this pressure which had broken his back. The harsh and rigid revenue system was left severely alone. All the Bill did was to disarm the money lender, so that he could not recover from the rayat the sums he had lent him to pay the Government demand. The money lender was made the scape-goat; and the Government, without a blush, took up the following characteristic position: Having

admitted that its own exactions had driven the rayat to the money lender, and having for years drained the money lenders' capital into its own treasury, it showed its magnanimity in purely vicarious fashion, by forgiving the rayat his debt to the money lender, while leaving untouched its own revenue exactions, the originating cause of all the mischief.

Now what would common sense suggest as the natural remedy for all this confusion and misery? Surely, a return to the good old rule the simple plan; the ancient customary usage, so dear to a conservative race, which should never have been upset. In the debate Mr. Hope well said that when we overturn "institutions which popular consent has maintained for above a score of centuries, we sometimes forget that we are not the bearers of a political revelation from heaven." It is not too late even now to retrace our steps, if we proceed with caution, and experimentally. And this is what was recommended by Sir James Caird, when, as a Famine Commissioner, he brought to the consideration of these questions an unbiassed judgment, and an unrivalled experience on all matters relating to land. His proposal was that experiments in levying the revenue in kind should be made in a few selected villages in various parts of India, the duty being entrusted to special officers known to be intelligent and painstaking. If by such experiments we could discover how one village can be made prosperous we should have a clue which would help us to make every village prosperous. In accordance with the proposal of Sir James Caird I took steps to organize an experiment on the lines suggested. It was in the Ahmednagar Collectorate, which was one of the disturbed districts in 1875. There is not space here to set forth the detailed arrangement. But the proposal was to offer to the rayats in a selected village a Permanent Settlement in kind, limiting the ordinary Government demand to a certain fixed share, say $\frac{1}{4}$ th (one anna in the rupee) of the gross produce. I suggested that fraction because in Bombay the revenue authorities profess not to take more than that proportion. Then, further, in order to encourage improvements, I proposed to fix for each field a quit rent, say $\frac{1}{8}$ th of an average dry crop, which the rayat might at any time elect to pay in cash instead of the $\frac{1}{4}$ th of the actual gross produce. An arrangement of this kind suited equally all classes of cultivators; the ignorant and apathetic man handing over his one anna share of millet at harvest time, and not being driven to the money-lender; while the enterprising man would dig a well, and elect to pay the cash quit-rent as soon as he found that the increased value of his irrigated crop (sugar-cane, cotton, spices, fruit, or what not), made that alternative profitable to him. Similarly, as regards the collection of the Government dues in kind, the best native models were to be

followed, the Government claim being assigned for a certain annual payment to persons of high character and good local position, on such terms as to interest them in the improvement and prosperity of the land. In selecting suitable persons for the proposed experiment I received much assistance from the American missionaries in the neighbourhood. They themselves cultivated a considerable amount of land, held from Government on the usual terms, and were in thorough touch with the villagers, knowing their language perfectly, and mingling with them in their daily life. With their help I was able to mature my scheme; and the Collector of the District forwarded it to the Government with an expression of his approval. Those directly interested in the experiment and best able to judge, were of opinion that the scheme would give contentment to the rayat; a field of useful enterprise to the capitalist who desired to occupy the honourable position of a land holder; and to the Government an increasing revenue, up to a possible amount three times the existing demand. It might have been thought that a carefully prepared proposal giving reasonable hope of such benefits, without cost to Government, and with peace and harmony all round, would have been welcomed by the authorities. But this was not so. The Collector who sent up the scheme was sharply rebuked for seeking to interfere with the existing order of things; and the proposal which promised such interesting and profitable results was nipped in the bud. A subsequent attempt met with a similar fate.

In the Debate above referred to, the rayat was described as "ruined, despairing, embittered"; and nothing has been done in these long years to remove the causes of his ruin, his despair, and his bitterness. To sum up, the case stands as follows. By its sins of omission and commission the Indian administration has brought the masses of the people into a state of economic collapse, so that they die like flies at the first touch of scarcity or disease; but when the remedies are pointed out to it, it will neither apply them itself, nor permit others to do so; even enquiry is refused. With shortsighted jealousy it has taken upon itself the whole responsibility of disaster; and sooner or later the penalties arising out of that responsibility will be exacted.

II.—THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK FOR INDIA.

By A. J. WILSON,
City Editor of "The Standard;" Editor of "The Investors'
Review."

Did the reader ever try to construct an ideal India on the lines suggested by the common habit of speech all men follow in speaking of our dominion there? England's rule, we hear on all hands, is beneficence itself compared with the tyrannies the

poor people had to endure under the former order of things. The capitalist is especially eloquent in describing the wonders done by us in the way of "developing" India, and the conquering soldier is not far behind him. Listening to the current talk, and reading the smug, self-satisfied language, the mind can easily draw a picture of an India prosperous above most countries in the world. Contented under our rule, the people flourish by help of the peace we insure them, and grow in wealth year by year. "Public works" are perpetually being constructed for their good, and, with rarely an interval, the foreign trade of the country expands—sure proof that all is well. Since the mutiny we have bestowed on the people thousands of miles of railways, dug them a few irrigating canals, conquered many fresh tracts of country for the redundant population to spread themselves over, created spinning and weaving industries to widen the range of employments open to them, and in many other ways laboured unceasingly to do them good. No Imperial power was ever known to do the like before in the history of the world, we are assured, and if the inhabitants of our great dependency are not happy the fault must lie in themselves. "They suffer from famine, the worst famine of the century, the worst perhaps ever experienced?" "Well, what of it? Is it not rather a good job on the whole, because it will force the Government to hurry up with those 'public works,' railways, and what not, we consider so absolutely essential to the future prosperity of the Empire?"

Such is the common argument. We have heard it over and over again. No facts are of avail against it. The idea has become burnt into the minds of the average newspaper-reading British patriot that all we do is for the good of India, and must produce that good because we say it ought to. And, therefore, such a calamity as the present appalling famine is serenely regarded as a passing accident in no way related to the true and legitimate results of our rule. Of course, it is a bit of a nuisance that so many wretched creatures should die; but, after all, would they not have died in far greater numbers had there been no railways to carry grain to the districts afflicted with drought? How can anybody be so foolish as to suppose that we have a responsibility for the "act of God" in failing to send rain for the past three years in sufficient quantity to prevent millions from perishing of hunger and disease?

Great force would lie in this reasoning if our deeds in India had really been of the disinterested, beneficent type we so usually hear them described. If, when we found the whole Peninsula at our feet in 1858, at the close of the mutiny, we had set to work to quietly develop the small immediate re-

sources around us, husbanding the revenue, enlarging the capacity of the country out of surpluses, spending as little as possible of the means provided by the usurer; if we had cut more waterways and built fewer railways, abstained from conquests and numberless frontier wars, then, indeed, to-day might have disclosed a people strong to fight its own battle against hunger, happy in the ease of assured peace. The "little stores of grain in every village," to whose existence in his youth Sir William Wedderburn testified before an idle and careless House of Commons, would have been all intact and more. We should not have had to witness a Government, full of benevolence, compelled to borrow, five, six, perhaps ten, millions sterling to enable it to reduce by possibly two-thirds the number of millions now destined to perish of hunger.

Is not this borrowing and borrowing the crux of the whole matter? The very money the Imperial *Raj* in India must borrow to fight this famine will be added to the permanent debt burdens of the dependency, just as former drafts upon the usurer's help have been, and the last state of the people be therefore worse than the first. Upholders of our "forward" policy in India always leave this aspect of the problem out of their reckoning. They habitually talk as if all the borrowed money spent in India had been *given* to it, not lent at high rates of interest by capitalists foreign to the country, who come year in and out for their income. No attempt was ever made to find out what the economic effect of the expenditure of enormous sums of foreign money was likely to be on the prosperity of India, or on the durability of our rule there. All was haphazard and assumption. We said this money would do good and it therefore must be so.

But how squares the fact with the comfortable theory? The simplest way to answer this question is to look at the expansion in the "Home charges" borne by India, as, not without a certain irony, the yearly-mounting sums the Government of the dependency is compelled to remit are commonly termed. When the Home Government, after the mutiny, took the direct responsibility of administering the affairs of India, the total direct debt for which it was liable was under 70 millions sterling and the interest charges under 2½ millions. This was exclusive of about 26 millions raised to build railways under the costly and extravagant, but popular, guarantee-of-the-State system, but the entire "Home charges" did not amount to £8,000,000. Such charges now approach £20,000,000, exclusive of private remittances. The estimated population of the territories under British rule was about 1½ millions, occupying an area of some 840,000 square miles. Between that date and 1880 the population increased about twelve millions, partly through an extension in the area of our dominions,

and the total debt load, including railway capital expenditure, every penny of it borrowed, and an outlay of nearly fifty millions sterling on other "public works," had increased from a total of less than £100,000,000 to nearly £260,000,000. To-day the entire capital obligations of the Government of India, all borne by the humble peasantry, by a toiling population whose average yearly income per head is not £5 of our money, amounts to about £500,000,000, including the capitalised value of the annuities granted on a most liberal scale by the Calcutta Government in part payment for the three guaranteed railways so far bought up by the State. This prodigious load is carried by less than 225 millions of people directly under our sway, in the enlarged territories conquered by us since 1857. By these conquests the area of the empire has been enlarged some 120,000 square miles.

The sum of the matter then, is, that while the territory governed has within a period of less than 40 years expanded about 15 per cent., and the population about 30 per cent., the debt has multiplied five-fold, and is altogether out of proportion to the wealth and resources of the country. Nor is the position by any means all exhibited by a mere bald recital of this sort. The expenditure of the dominant power has grown in all directions. One form of extravagance leads to others infallibly, and the revenue wrung from the people is now nearly 1,000 million rupees per annum. As recently as 1860 it was less than 400 millions. Only a slender part of this increase comes from the returns yielded by the public works of whose beneficent effects upon the well-being of the natives we have heard so much. Indeed, the railways still remain a tax upon the general revenues of the country, owing to the extravagant terms upon which the capital for them was raised, and to the number of lines constructed merely as part of the military provisions of the dominant power, intent on self-preservation. In spite, too, of all this fresh money thrown into India every year—and lately the stream has risen to about £10,000,000 per annum, not counting the private capital embarked in tea cultivation and other private enterprises—the Government of India has always to wrestle against deficits in its budgets. By ingenious scheming the estimates may show a surplus, but actual results one year with another land the State on the wrong side of the balance sheet. This means further additions to the permanent debt, further pressure upon the helpless natives. All is quite systematic, functioning like clockwork, and all tends to the ultimate destruction of our dominion far more surely than disaffection, conspiracy or foreign invasion. When the present awful hunger is over and gone, at the cost of perhaps ten millions sterling and as many millions of human lives, the money expense

it has entailed will be added serenely to the "funded debt" of India and laid upon the backs of the inhabitants that remain. Such is the patent British system for insuring "progress"—and it does. Nothing can be more sure in this world than that by this system a nation, an empire, is hurried straight to perdition. Some day the Government of India must find itself unable to pay its way, because unable to borrow. When that day comes it may not be "good bye, glorious empire," for experience proves that bankrupt states live long and thrive sometimes, in a sense, more than those that are solvent. But where will our mighty empire be when the day comes that India says: "I am worn out and can no more keep up the fabric reared on my over-burdened back by this never-resting 'progress'—progress of which my soul is weary unto death?"

Purblind Indian bureaucrats may rest assured that no salvation can come to the country they govern through any manipulation of the Exchange, any propping up of the value of the rupee. The cardinal factor in the position created by our un-resting struggles to "improve" India is the necessity they have laid upon its alien Government to find so many millions sterling every year to pay her obligations in England—not debt obligations merely, though these count for more than half the State's burden here, but military waste and folly also. The short service system, furthermore, with its pensions, and the steadily increasing demands of private capital invested by us in India, all involve payments which have to come from the produce of the people's labour, returning to them no adequate compensation, generally no compensation at all. It is the myth of the shirt of Nessus in real life for us. We have entered upon a course which admits of no turning back—there is the pathos of it. Indian people must do to uphold our splendour, to feed our industries, and sustain our home credit, to provide pensions for the "exiles," a few brief years its masters, sent back to vegetate in their native land before the climate of India has made too great wrecks of them. And "public works" must go on. The famine itself convinces our routine "politicals" more than ever of this necessity. There is nothing for it but to submit, and wait in sadness for the end. Will it come soon? Ah, that no man can say. But this is true: The capital now embarked by us annually in India does not amount to 200 million rupees, whereas the amount due by India to England on public and private account is now about 500 million rupees per annum. Every year the divergences between the help given—at interest more or less good—and the amount due by India tends to widen by at least the amount of additional interest, profits, and savings remitted home by Government and private citizens. The day approaches, therefore, when the Government of India must face the question of a composition with its creditors. As long, however, as it is able to borrow, on one pretext or other, coin to pay for food for its starving subjects, it can put off that day. And we shall lend joyfully and with unquestioning faith as long as we have the means, or can borrow the means from somewhere else. Therefore the future, insecure as it is, top-heavy as it is, may last our time and beyond. But the end

we foreshadow must come one day, and may be hastened by an accident, unless the men who rule India can be persuaded to economise and economise until taxes can be reduced and the sources of wealth for the people developed out of savings and genuine surplus resources.

III.—FIGHTING THE FAMINE.

By W. M. J. WILLIAMS.

Among Britons everywhere sympathy is deep and genuine, and there will be a desire to know the present position of the famine among their fellow-citizens in India and Burma. The £360,000 which has already been paid into the Lord Mayor of London's Fund alone, is some evidence of this, but by no means an adequate representation of the real sympathy felt by the British people.

Before passing on to notice facts bearing directly on these matters it is impossible to peruse the latest official documents published regarding the famine without regretting the way in which the full knowledge of great suffering was withheld from Parliament and the British public. Telegraphic communication between the Viceroy and the Secretary for India from the beginning of October to the 10th of January is before us. Surely the official calm in face of reports which were reaching them was too cool; the official optimism and circumlocution were almost culpable, since the stake was so many lives. There was no means of avoiding an encounter with famine, and, at best, great suffering from the first. Rains since October were wholly inadequate, prices had been rising and were rising sharply a week before the message of December 17, recommending no action in England by way of subscriptions, after this date the same or worse tale of the rains, and the number "on relief" had risen from 266,100 on the 4th December to 531,900 on December 25th. Nor is it very pleasant to find that only as Parliament was about to meet, as the Secretary for India reminds us in his telegram of January 1st, was the decision taken to let the British public have an opportunity of knowing the grim truth, and showing their readiness to aid. By that time those "on relief" were nearly 1,183,000 (see January 8th). Long before this it was evident that before fresh crops could arrive large numbers would suffer, and it is to be feared that an addiction to autocratic methods of Government, led to a lack of promptitude in exposing need. Some private benevolence might have been of great service while Government measures were getting into train, and such relief would have been justified, even though granted on wasteful lines.

At last, however, we have a perusal of the official papers, which declare the magnitude of the calamity. In a despatch to the Viceroy, the Secretary for India, giving the position on the 10th January, attempts a tabular view of the famine and the distress areas in British India. Though already

out of date the figures will be useful for comparison:—

	FAMINE.		DISTRESS.	
	Square Miles.	Population.	Square Miles.	Population.
Punjab	16,800	4,139,000	30,100	6,559,000
N.-W. Provinces ..	26,200	11,273,000	50,600	26,013,000
Bengal	6,700	5,381,000	9,900	8,265,000
Burma	2,600	212,000	8,600	555,000
Madras	8,500	1,206,000	—	—
Bombay	43,000	7,009,000	9,300	2,064,000
Central Provinces ..	60,200	7,824,000	13,200	1,019,000
Total ..	164,000	36,944,000	121,700	44,475,000

So that in the first week in January areas as above, containing over 81,000,000 of people, were in distress, one half nearly of that number with many famishing among them. In other words, areas containing twice the population of Great Britain and Ireland were "distressed" or "famine" areas. At that time 1,200,000 were receiving relief, 248,000 gratuitously. As this is written, there comes the weekly telegram from the Viceroy published in the *Times* of 16th February, giving figures for the week previous. It is not pleasant reading. Comparing it with the above table one sees reason to believe the figures very imperfect as they stand. Yet they seem to show that in Madras, Bengal, North-West Provinces, and Burma there has been a considerable transfer from the "distress" to the "famine" category, and as to Bombay and the Central Provinces the figures are evidently very unsatisfactory as they now appear. But, including Native States, the numbers on relief are now said to be 2,750,000, or double what they were in January. The general report however, is clear, and confirms this view. It says:—

"During week scattered showers only reported in affected tracts. . . . Situation little changed since January telegrams as regards the extent and severity of the distress. Increasing numbers on relief indicate gradual exhaustion of resources, extension of relief system, increasing acquaintance with and readiness to resort to it. Increase will continue in North-West Provinces and Oudh till March, and may temporarily decrease harvest time, but will rise again in May and June. The same as regards Central Provinces. Much depends on course of prices. Prices show a tendency to fall, as fair crops are expected in portions of North-West Provinces and Oudh and Punjab. In Punjab distress is confined to three or four districts, in Deccan no improvement possible till monsoon. In Central Provinces character of spring harvest uncertain, but yield must be poor, throughout Bengal, effect of poor winter rice harvest is widespread, but knowledge of Burma surplus keeps down prices, and distress is not appearing in North Behar rice tracts as rapidly as was anticipated."

Is it necessary to add that this is, probably, the brightest light than can be thrown on the dismal picture, whether that of the actual or of the prospective position? The most unimaginative must realise that for months to come a continuous battle will have to be fought with the most relentless enemy known to man. Nor will the worse results of the visitation be visible in the physical condition of the people: it may be accepted at once that the moral fibre of those who suffer these great misfortunes will be

profoundly affected, and in large numbers of cases with most lamentable results. To those whose duty it is to superintend the welfare of India's millions, these graver effects of the famine will, undoubtedly, be a matter of profound sorrow and concern. That being so, it will be of great interest to turn to the efforts which we are making to battle with the enemy and bring relief to the sufferers.

The methods of relief fall into two classes, by official and by private effort. Let us take the latter first. In a despatch of 23rd December last, the Viceroy believed that should winter rains fail, "India will be involved in a calamity which will equal, if not transcend, in magnitude any similar calamity that has befallen her during the present century." The rains have failed. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that "there is ample scope for the operation of private charity outside the definite task of saving people from starvation which the Government has taken upon its shoulders." This would be, it was said, of the "greatest political value, as tending to draw together in the bond of sympathy the people of the two countries." Yet while this was said, a suggestion was added that the opening of subscription lists should be deferred. That attitude is to some extent explained in a quotation given from correspondence between Lord Lytton and Lord Cranbrook in 1878, in which it is laid down, "that the Government is responsible as far as may be practicable for the saving of life by all available means in its power," and private subscriptions, it was said, "can make no appreciable difference." This was neither very clear nor satisfactory in tone. In this despatch of December 23rd, it is added:—

"To these principles we steadfastly adhere. To invite subscriptions, which are to be spent in the performance of a task for which we have undertaken the responsibility, would be to invite them for the relief of the Indian Exchequer, an end towards which we could neither ask nor receive contributions with propriety."

This was against "asking" for private aid. The attitude was more histrionic than heroic.

The whole of the despatch more than justifies the impatience of England at the end of the year, by the hopelessly bureaucratic spirit it breathes, an exhibition of which at such a juncture will not commend the administration of India to the better graces of British subjects at home or abroad. To prevent overlapping and to supplement operations organised by Government where *famine* prevails, the following suggestions are made:—

1. Supplement the subsistence ration given, by adding small comforts of food, clothing, etc., for aged, infirm, and children.
2. Provide for the maintenance of orphans. Waifs are many after a famine.
3. Relieve respectable poor, who suffer privation rather than apply.
4. Render aid for a fresh start in life, to those who have lost their all, such as small cultivators.

It is then suggested that a Central Indian Committee in Calcutta, in touch with Provincial and Local Committees, shall be formed to co-operate with the Government while superintending the administration of all money received, whether from England, India or elsewhere. All this shows some effort to utilise generous private aid, and doubtless it will be

wise to regard experience and knowledge of the country; but it would be better to fail in symmetry of organization than to lose the opportunity of saving life, and opportunity is limited by fleeting time.

The task of the Indian Government at the moment is a stupendous one, and that Government is once again being specially tried. The most formidable and persistent opponents of its general policy will heartily applaud a vigorous and successful encounter with present difficulties. Official information to hand is more suggestive of methods proposed, than adequate to exhibit the efficiency of their application. The Famine Code as revised in 1895 seems complete as a scheme, and errs, perhaps, on paper, by excess of detail. So far as officers are concerned it is evident that responsibility for success will largely fall upon collectors, engineers and commissioners of Districts. It is satisfactory to find the leading instructions during famine to be that Local Boards are to "subordinate the ordinary objects and methods of their expenditure to the special consideration of saving life." Relief works are provided for, both as a test, and as a wise method of granting relief. Poor houses are provided for destitute persons without homes, and unfit for employment on works. Here cooked food is distributed gratuitously. Space will not permit of more than reference to this code, which, as given, is that for the North-West Provinces, but may be taken as a sample of that for the whole country. An important feature is the power to grant gratuitous relief in any case, especially to assist in maintaining a home. Of course the choice of works undertaken during the relief operations is of vast importance, and the code seems to provide for railways and roads as the principal relief works. The Secretary for India in January ticks off others sanctioned by the Indian Government of which he approves. Water for irrigation has been made available as far as possible, large advances or loans have been made to landholders for work on their estates, and to rayats ready to dig wells: Government forests have been opened so as to provide fodder, as beasts suffer also. The railway rates for food have been reduced where pressure is greatest; suspensions of revenue have been granted. Rather low down on the list is an approval of works on canals. Special inducements have been held out by Government to capitalists and local bodies to undertake work on light railways, and Local Governments are empowered and directed to organise a sufficient staff of relief officers.

A primary consideration remains, the supply of food. It was confidently believed that the supply was "practically sufficient for the needs of the people, Burma and South India having a large surplus. This was in the middle of January. Private trade is encouraged to supply it where wanted. But Local Governments are to arrange with local dealers for sending food to any relief work where it is running short. The wage paid at works for relief labour, and also the gratuitous dole, is calculated according to a ration of food fixed by a table, and not by its money value. But it is confessed that, as compared with 1876-7, the surplus of

food is this year not so extensive, and indeed it is known by other means that already export from India has practically ceased. As it is intimated that anxiety will not be over until favourable rains have fallen in July and August, this makes the Government's responsibility heavy and keen, nor can it any longer discourage supplies kindly sent from Russia or any other source.

The efforts of Government thus outlined are reported this week as working as follows:

"In all provinces relief arrangements reported adequate and working well. Enquiry being made sufficiently as to Madras famine wage. Health of people and of relief workers generally good to fair in Central Provinces, where relief measures have greatly expanded. Cases of extreme famine emaciation small in proportion to numbers relieved, and occur chiefly in poor houses situated in districts where people did not come in time for help. Classes on works are mostly low-caste labourers and petty cultivators. In villages and towns home relief given largely to women and children of better classes. Provincial and local committees of Indian famine fund are now at work specially distributing blankets and clothing in poor houses and relief camps. Committees for North-West Provinces and Oudh estimate minimum requirements at 20 lakhs, and other provinces proportionately. Relief fund will do great good, food supplies are generally reported adequate, and no province has experienced serious difficulty. Wheat and barley are being sold for April delivery in Punjab at prices below present rates."

Almost every sentence of this telegraphic report suggests a question. The roseate colour in which things are so frequently presented makes one desirous to know what is considered "serious difficulty," and both in this statement and the figures accompanying it no estimate of the death rate is given. There is yet great fear lest much privation is unacknowledged where relief has not been sought, so that means must be taken to find the condition of many reticent families. The reference to Madras and the "famine wage" is a little disquieting, especially as the relief officially allotted must be scanty fare. This may be enough to emphasize the brief reference to a relief fund and its goodness, which seems to be a private relief fund, the need of which was so tardily acknowledged. The more the official reports from October last to this date are perused, the more the conviction grows that there is ample room, nay, a great call for a private service supplementary to the Government system of relief. It is to be feared that only by such means can a rather numerous class of cases be discovered, only by a volunteer agency not wholly regulated by Government officers. Lord George Hamilton in his last published despatch to the Viceroy, casts the responsibility for an adequate effort to cope with the situation upon the Indian Government and its officials. The Viceroy is assured of support by the Home Authorities. This is in accord with the universally expressed wishes of the British people, many of whom are subscribing large sums to the various famine funds. So general is the desire that effort should be completely successful, that it is clear that the British Government would be supported as with one voice, were it to declare it necessary to vote relief to India for famine purposes; and this being so it cannot be too strongly urged upon the Indian authorities how thoroughly they may rely on support from home, and how great also is their responsibility both in report and in administration.

IV.—THE CAUSES OF THE FAMINE.

By J. DACOSTA.

At the debate on the address Sir William Wedderburn's amendment proposing an enquiry into the condition of the Indian people with a view to ascertain the causes by reason of which they were helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine, was opposed by Lord George Hamilton on the grounds (i) that a portion of the forces of the Indian Government which were warring against the advances of famine, would be removed from the sphere of action to the sphere of speculation, and (ii) that it is a mistake for any member of the House to hold out the hope that any remedies that he can suggest can prevent famine from desolating India. As the grounds thus authoritatively advanced were not supported by any argument or statement of facts or any evidence whatever, it becomes urgent to scrutinise the validity of the reasons which the Indian Secretary pleaded for opposing enquiry into the causes of a great national calamity which periodically inflicts the inexpressible suffering of starvation on millions of Her Majesty's subjects.

Of the two objections which Lord George Hamilton raised in the words quoted above, the first presents merely an administrative difficulty which can, no doubt, be satisfactorily overcome by some of the able and experienced statesmen who have devoted their services to the administration of our great dependency.

The other objection, namely, that no remedy can be suggested that will prevent famine from desolating India, is startling and seems utterly untenable in view of the records of Indian history itself. In 1770, thirteen years after the battle of Plassey and the introduction of British rule in Bengal, that fertile province was devastated by an appalling famine of which an eye-witness, the Honourable John Shore afterwards Lord Teignmouth, has left us a most affecting description. A few years later Lord Cornwallis went to India as Governor General and suggested permanent fixity in the land tax, as the measure best calculated to restore prosperity among a people who subsisted chiefly by agriculture: in a despatch dated 3rd February 1790, he said:

"There is this further advantage to be expected from a fixed assessment in a country subject to drought and inundation, that it affords a strong inducement to the landholder to exert himself to repair as speedily as possible the damages which his land may have sustained from those calamities. His ability to raise money to make these exertions will be proportionately increased by the additional value which the limitation of the public demand will stamp upon his landed property: the reverse is to be expected when the public assessment is subject to unlimited increase."

Accordingly throughout the extensive province where the land tax was permanently fixed in 1793, the horrors of famine have been unknown for more than half a century; and official records testify to the growing prosperity of the people under the Permanent Settlement Regulations, as well as to their increased ability to tide over seasons of drought and inundation. Official records likewise show that when similar calamities befel our other

Indian provinces where arbitrary assessments prevail, their populations were subjected to those acute sufferings which have been so graphically described by Lord Teignmouth with regard to the Bengal famine of 1770, and by credible witnesses of the Orissa famine of 1866, and of the famines in Madras, Bombay and the N.W. Provinces in 1877, 1878, and 1879.

Reverting further to the historical facts alluded to above, the following extracts will show that, with the exception of the enlightened and marvellously successful policy which Lord Cornwallis inaugurated in Bengal, our land system in India has been marked throughout by a lamentable degree of shortsightedness and rapacity.

"The over-estimate of the capabilities of the Deccan, acted upon by our early Collectors, drained the country of its agricultural capital, and accounts for the poverty and distress in which the cultivating population has ever since been plunged. . . . All betokens a state of poverty. The more unfavourable results must mainly be attributed to a greater degree of over-taxation." ("Blue book on the Deccan Riots Commission, 1878, page 10.")

"The margin left for the cultivator's subsistence is less than the value of the labour he has expended on the land. . . . This district has the benefit of water communication by both the Ganges and the Jumna; it is intersected by the East Indian Railway and is partly traversed by the Ganges Canal; yet the land is only worth five years' purchase, and the state of the average cultivator is one of hopeless insolvency and misery." ("Report of the Collector of Cawnpore, 1879, on the settlement of that district.")

"This district has been much mismanaged, and unauthorised charges and illegal modes of duress have prevailed very extensively. The revision of the Settlement took place at a period when the disposition to over-assess was far from being allayed. It is impossible in districts so greatly injured in their circumstances and more in what the French call their *morale* by oppressive assessments, that the mistakes and evils which have arisen can be redressed at one operation. No slight benefit will have been gained if the Government are convinced of the actual loss of money which is certain to follow over-assessment." ("Mr. Bird's report on the condition of the Budaon district.")

"The Government has read with much concern the opinion expressed by the Collector as to the undue pressure of the revised rates, in consequence of which a large quantity of land has been put up for sale in default of revenue, much of which found no purchasers." ("Government Minute on the report of the Collector of Sholapore for 1872-73.")

"The land revenue Collections in Madras for 1876-77 are returned at £3,296,575, showing a decrease of £1,248,438 below those of the previous year. Large remissions of revenue were rendered necessary on account of the decrease of cultivation and failure of crops. No remissions, however, had to be granted out of the permanently settled demand." ("Moral and material condition of India for 1876-77, page 28.")

"It seems to me in the face of such considerations quite unreasonable to urge that the revision of the

revenue survey had nothing to do with the present crisis. These considerations justify me in placing the excessive enhancement of the assessments as the special cause which has disturbed the relations of debtor and creditor in the Poona and adjoining districts." ("Report of Sir Auckland Colvin as member of the Deccan Riots Commission.")

These official statements, all pointing in the same direction, furnish an answer to the question raised in Sir William Wedderburn's amendment, seeing that they place beyond a doubt the fact that the helplessness of the Indian people to resist even the first attacks of famine is due to the poverty and destitution in which they have been plunged by oppressive taxation, chiefly in the form of excessive land assessments. On the other hand, the statements which will now be quoted, will expose, with equal force, the hollowness of Lord George Hamilton's unsupported assertion that no remedy can be suggested that will prevent famine from desolating India.

"The revenue of the permanently settled estates in Bengal has for years been realised with great punctuality. Losses sometimes occur through failure of crops, epidemics, the devastations of cyclones and other calamities of seasons; but as a rule the large present excess of the annual rental over the Government demand, enables holders to meet that demand even in the most disastrous years." ("Sir George Campbell's Administration report for 1872-73.")

"Great as was the progress which I knew had been made in the position of the cultivating classes, I was, quite unprepared to find them occupying a position so different from that which I remembered them to occupy when I first came to the country. They were then poor and oppressed, with little incentive to increase the productive powers of the soil. I find them now as prosperous, as independent and as comfortable as the peasantry, I believe, of any country in the world; well fed, well clothed, free to enjoy the full benefit of their own labours and to hold their own and obtain prompt redress for any wrong." ("Sir Ashley Eden's speech in Calcutta in 1877.")

These documents and numerous other official records of the period conclusively show that when drought or inundation causes serious damage to the crops in the permanently settled districts, their population is not subjected thereby to the acute sufferings, nor does the State sustain the heavy loss of land revenue, which invariably mark similar visitations in our other Indian provinces. The documents, moreover, expose the serious error under which Lord G. Hamilton labours, when he asserts it to be a mistake to seek a remedy for famine in India. His assertion is the more unaccountable and surprising in that it directly impugns the correctness of the views proclaimed by the head of the Government of which he is a member. Lord Salisbury, speaking at Bradford in 1877, said:—

"Depend upon it, the true remedy against famine and scarcity is the frugality of the people. The people ought in years of plenty to make money enough to lay up against these times of famine. It is rather to this than to any great and passionate expenditure in public works that I would look for a remedy."

The earnestness of Lord Salisbury's language on that occasion revealed his firm conviction in the soundness of the principle he was proclaiming; and a heavy responsibility attaches to the Government of India for having withheld the administrative action and moral support necessary for carrying that obviously true principle into effect. An equally grave responsibility must now rest on those who, by preventing enquiry into the causes of famine, have made themselves instrumental in perpetuating the vicious state of things to which Lord Salisbury so significantly called public attention.

V.—HARIYAR! MAHADEO, HARIYAR!

BY DONALD N. REID.

Siva or Mahadeo, the destroying god, and his consort, Parvati or Bhawáni, have their most ardent worshippers among the Hindu peasants of those provinces that are now being desolated by famine. *Mahadeo-asthans* and *Kali-chauras*, or in other words small shrines dedicated to the god and his consort, are to be found in every village of Behar, Oudh, and the North-Western Provinces. They generally consist of a small mud-built pedestal, surmounted by little idols; and are sometimes protected by a canopy of thatch or tiles. These shrines are much frequented by all classes of Hindus, on the occurrence of any calamity, and on the outbreak of small-pox or similar epidemics. In fact small-pox is always ascribed to the wrath of the malevolent goddess Bhawáni, and after her is named *deri*; while famine, blight, and destruction of crops by floods, drought, frost, or hailstorms are attributed to the wrath of Mahadeo, the destroying god. Hence, the invocation which goes up to heaven from the mouth of every devout Hindu peasant in the Valley of the Ganges during the sowing of the rabi—"Harियार! Mahadeo, harियार"—A familiar translation of which means "Clothe the fields with green, Mahadeo, clothe the fields with green." This solemn invocation, which comes from the innermost heart of the Indian peasant during the sowing season, was first heard by me in the year 1860, and I soon came to learn that the thoughts and words of the Indian peasantry were continually employed about Mahadeo, in much the same way that the name of the chief was uppermost in the minds of old-time Highlanders.

Recent events have looked as if the chiefs of the India Office and the Government of India were under the spell of Mahadeo in one of his evil moods (and had therefore unconsciously become his active agents), as the mischief which those chiefs have already worked is incalculable. The red-tapeism is prodigious of those gentlemen who are responsible for the welfare of our fellow-subjects in India, and in itself is striking evidence that some malevolent influence is at work to warp their minds. For instance, Lord George Hamilton professed to be horrified at Sir William Wedderburn's moderate and sensible demand for an immediate enquiry re-

garding the condition of the rayats, and he declared that "a more inopportune moment for such a proposal could not be imagined." But, without meaning to be rude, I beg to remind Lord George Hamilton of a happy quotation from Erasmus Darwin to the effect that "a fool is a man who never made an experiment"; and now is the time to try the experiment of devising means to stop deaths from starvation in India, instead of flourishing that ridiculous Famine Code in the faces of the unfortunate people. One can now thoroughly appreciate the following remarks of the late Mr. Aberigh Mackay in his well-known book "Twenty-one Days in India":—

"Lord Bacon's apophthegm was that reading maketh a full man; and it would be better to give the starving cultivator Bacon than the report of that Commission (which we cannot name without tears and laughter) which goes to work on the assumption that writing maketh a full man—that to write over a certain area of paper will fill the collapsed cuticles of the agricultural classes throughout India."

Lord George Hamilton is, however, responsible for the astounding statement that famines are "inevitable incidents in India," and he therefore thinks that "it is a mistake and is wrong for any member of this House to hold out the hope that any remedies which he can suggest can prevent famines from desolating India." Who will now say that his lordship was not under the evil spell of Mahadeo when he made these mischievous and utterly misleading statements? The malevolent spirit of the hour was however found in Mr. Rhownaggee, a loyal henchman of the chief of the India Office. Now, I cannot say anything regarding Mr. Rhownaggee's practical knowledge of the rayat and his affairs; but it was evident that he had a shrewd suspicion of the rottenness of the impossible case which he was called upon to champion, as he could think of nothing better than to besmirch the reputation of gentlemen who are engaged in the thankless task of trying to ameliorate the condition of the poverty-stricken peasants of India.

But to get back again to Mahadeo, the destroying god of the Hindus, we find him at Lord Elgin's elbow on more than one eventful occasion. Surely Lord Elgin must have been unconsciously influenced by Mahadeo when he held the telescope to his official eye at Jabalpur, and remarked that he had been struck by the appearance of prosperity which characterised the country "right up to the gates of the city." Mr. Goodridge's letter to the *Calcutta Englishman* and the statement of the Central News correspondent regarding the condition of the Jabalpur rayats, had not been published when the Viceroy made his light-hearted speech. But both Mr. Goodridge and the Central News correspondent testify to the fact that the wrath of Mahadeo and his consort Bhawani had played havoc for months among the unhappy inhabitants of Jabalpur and the neighbouring districts.

I have had many a wrestle with Mahadeo, but up to date he has proved too strong for me. For instance, if the reader will kindly refer to the *Journal of the Society of Arts* for the 30th of January 1885, he will find that I put the whole case in a nutshell, against the destroying god, during a discussion which followed a lecture delivered by Sir Edward

Buck (then Mr. Buck). I said that the popular idea was that the productive power of the soil of India could not be increased, as people blindly thought that there were no proper means at the disposal of the rayat. But in North Behar alone there are 15,947 saltpetre works and 1,304 saltpetre refineries, which are doing Mahadeo's work in using up the essence of the manure of every village in this densely populated province, the whole of the saltpetre being exported. To prove the suicidal policy of this system I said that, in 1884, which was a year of drought in Behar, I plucked a wheat plant in a field near one of these saltpetre works, and this plant in its green state weighed 640 drachms, or 2½ lbs, as it had been properly nourished on the nitrogen from the earth of the saltpetre works. A little further on in the same field, I plucked another wheat plant which only weighed 4½ drachms in its green state; but this plant had not received any of the nitrogen from the works, and was solely dependent on the impoverished soil for plant-food. No rain had fallen from the day they were sown in October, and I plucked them towards the end of February, the plants having grown during all those months without the aid of irrigation. But the difference was most marked between the properly-nourished and the badly-nourished plants. Here, however, was an everyday object lesson which was neglected by the worshippers of Mahadeo.

The most awful visitation of Mahadeo's wrath upon an industrious people that was ever witnessed by me, took the form of a hail-storm in February 1866. I had taken over charge of a new factory in the Saran district a few weeks before this disastrous event, and I well remember how favourably I had been struck by the appearance of the country and the growing crops of the rayats. The villages were embosomed in lovely fields of poppy, in all the snowy whiteness of full bloom which is reached before the drug begins to form; wheat and barley were in ear, and presented a most luxuriant appearance; hundreds of acres of arhar plant hid me and my horse every morning as I went my rounds; the low-lying paddy fields covered their ugliness in the soft blue flower of the flax plant; the mango and early summer fruit trees were beginning to blossom. But one afternoon a black cloud came rolling up from the west, charged with hail-stones as big as a child's hand; and in half-an-hour the crops of all my villagers were levelled with the ground and cut to pieces as if they had been trodden out by bullocks on the threshing-floor. The beautiful trees were stripped of their leaves and branches, and among the debris dead birds were lying. Here and there a bullock was to be seen killed by the hail-stones before it reached the friendly shelter of the village. And as for the tiles of my bungalow and factory buildings, I could not discover a piece that was bigger than a penny-bit, so completely had they been smashed within the space of little more than half-an-hour. Heart-rending was the wail that went up to Mahadeo and his consort Bhawani from the ruined villagers. The false and fickle god had failed them at the eleventh hour when their crops were ripening for the sickle, and now nothing but starvation stared them in the face.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MARCH, 1897.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY.¹

After an interval of some months we are able to welcome the appearance of the third and last of Colonel H. B. Hanna's works on Indian Problems. The publication of "Backwards or Forwards?" coincides with India's agony in the clutch of the greatest disaster of the century, just as the previous volume of the series provided an opportune reply to the specious arguments advanced against the late Government's wise decision to abandon Chitral. Taken in connexion with its predecessors the present brochure exhibits an exhaustive yet condensed and closely reasoned exposure of the whole framework of fallacies, prejudices, and wrong-headed ambitions that have driven the military advisers of the Government of India along the path which has ended in the present distressing condition of our fellow-subjects. If any evidence, either of statistics or of expert opinion, be necessary to clinch the arguments and emphasize the conclusions of the earlier volumes, it is to be found here. Following up his attack on the military policy of the last twenty years, the gallant

author examines in detail the value of the huge and costly works at Quetta and Rawal Pindi, and triumphantly shows their utter worthlessness, even from the point of view of the end which they were ostensibly designed to serve. The ruinous extravagance and futility of the military railways on the North-West frontier then receive condign punishment from the Colonel's pen, and the total cost of the misguided "forward policy" is estimated. Readers of INDIA know how often these questions have been treated in our columns, yet the most convinced opponent of the official view will welcome so handy and complete a *résumé* of the grounds of his belief, and endorse the conclusion reached by a display of unfaltering moral courage, which is the more remarkable in a member of a service where departure from traditional opinions is regarded as little short of treachery, and where adherence to the right, if it is not also the popular, view is visited with severe if refined penalties. Not the least valuable parts of a valuable work are the sketch map showing the military and commercial railways built or building on the North-West frontier, and the very complete estimate of the approximate cost of the "forward policy" down to the end of 1896, including the war of 1878-80. There it is shown that the total sum expended exceeds seven hundred millions of rupees. During the same period the cost of the police has nearly doubled, and the cost of the political department has more than doubled, while the cost of the Army, exclusive of military works, special works, Deferred Pay, and rise in Exchange, has increased by over a third. The Secretary of State for India sold, during the last financial year, bills for over three hundred and twenty millions of rupees as against one hundred and seventeen millions in 1877-8, an increase of eighty per cent, measured in pounds sterling.

With ironical acuteness the appeals to authority are drawn largely from the utterances of the avowed supporters of the theories which are under examination. On Lord Mayor's Day 1878, Lord Beaconsfield declared that,

"So far as the invasion of India in that quarter is concerned, it is the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that it is scarcely practicable. The base of operations of any possible foe is so remote, the communications are so difficult, the aspect of the country so forbidding, that we have long arrived at the opinion that an invasion of our Empire, by passing the mountains which form our North-West frontier, is one which we need not dread."

From a detailed examination of the country between the Trans-Caucasus and the Indus, and of the forces available to Russia in the former district, it is seen that in spite of the great extension of railways in Central Asia the words of Lord Beaconsfield are as true to-day as they were when they were uttered.

"It would require a Ganges or an Indus or both to give

¹ Indian Problems, No. 3. Backwards or Forwards? by Colonel H. B. Hanna. Constable, Westminster.

Central Asia a chance of ever rivalling India in fertility. . . . Mr. C. E. Biddulph, an Indian civilian, who made the journey within the last few years, estimates the cultivable land throughout the whole of Central Asia at 2.2 per cent."

It follows that there is little chance "of any considerable addition being made to the 41,000 troops of all arms of which their Russian garrison is now composed, and we may dismiss from our minds the fear that Central Asia can ever be used as a base whence to attempt the conquest of India." The scare with reference to a Russian occupation of Herat is equally groundless. "Herat city is a mass of mud hovels sheltering some 5,000 souls, exclusive of the garrison." Sir Henry Durand affirmed his opinion that,

"To speak of the integrity of the place as of vital importance to British India was a hyperbole so insulting to common sense as scarcely to need refutation, and which ignorance of the countries west of the Indus, and experience of military operations in the East, could alone palliate."

Provided that a rational plan decrees the withdrawal of the British frontier to Jacobabad, India may remain calm even while Russia subdues the whole of Afghanistan and occupies Quetta and Jellalabad. Then the two frontiers are "separated by two hundred and two miles of painful and difficult road" at the southern extremity, "while at the northern extremity eighty-one miles of formidable passes would separate Peshawar from Jellalabad." With our granary at Multan great difficulty is experienced in feeding the garrison of three to four thousand men stationed in Quetta, which is capable of accommodating fifteen thousand. Is it probable therefore that Russia with her true base at Tiflis, 1,748 miles away, dependent for supplies on "a single-lined railway liable at one part of its course to be interrupted by sand, at another by snow, at a third by floods, exposed for hundreds of miles to the danger of a flank attack from Persia (unless we are to concede that Persia too has become a Russian province) and for other hundreds to the raids of Afghan tribes," and ending in a desert, is it probable that Russia would be able to maintain at Quetta such a garrison that any portion could be detached for an invasion? And when the terminus is reached "the terrible transport difficulty would be awaiting them." The tremendous waste of baggage animals on the British frontier during the numerous frontier wars, which in addition to the vast sums entered under the head of transport in the estimates, absorbs most of the cost of "mobilization," confirms the opinion, formed in 1882, of General Skobelev, who in his ignorance had spoken a few years previously of "masses of Asiatic cavalry" to be hurled on India. He said, after his subjugation of Akhal,

"To invade India we should need 150,000 troops, 60,000 to enter India with, and 90,000 to guard communications. If 5000 men needed 20,000 camels (as in the Akhal war), what

would 150,000 need and where could we get the transport? We should require vast supplies, for Afghanistan is a poor country, and could not feed 60,000 men, and we should have to fight the Afghans as well as you."

Any Russian force which succeeds in forcing its way through Afghanistan must be infinitesimally small, and against such a force the extravagant fortifications of Quetta and Rawal Pindi, requiring each an army corps to man properly, are worse than absurd. Yet Sir George Chesney assured an audience of British officers that these works were merely intended as a "precaution in the event of our being taken by surprise." Comment on the notion of a surprise is superfluous.

The answer then to the question asked on the title page becomes apparent.

"What would be an act of prudence, wisdom, and moderation at a time when we are successful, would certainly be considered by the tribes on our border as an act of weakness if undertaken at the commencement of a war."

Thus Lord Roberts in his memorandum dated Kabul, May 29th 1880. Yet Sir George Chesney, who for five years was military Secretary to the Indian Government, and for five years Military Member of the Viceroy's Council, admits that on the outbreak of war the first step would consist in concentration on Quetta, Peshawar, and Rawal Pindi, and the abandonment of the frontier outposts such as Chitral, Gilgit, and the numerous smaller forts. What then becomes of the arguments based on prestige that were urged against a withdrawal from Chitral? The only prudent and honourable course open to us is to sanction at once a withdrawal which must come if war ever threatens, and is all the more necessary if, as undoubtedly is the case, Russia can never threaten India, for then the only arguments advanced to support our encroachments on Afghanistan fall to the ground. But our retirement must not be limited to the Quetta line, it must be carried back to the valley of the Indus, the natural frontier. To this conclusion one is inevitably led by the arguments put forward by the most competent authorities.

"The new frontier which has replaced that of the Indus Valley not only lacks the advantages attaching to the latter, but has actually transformed them into dangers; its communications are bad [a fact patent to every one acquainted with the disastrous history of the Sibi-Pishin and Harnai Valley Railways]; all our attempts to render them trustworthy have failed; and the forces by which it is held are out of proportion small compared to the area and character of the country, and the temper of the people they are expected to control."

Reason for the present policy there is strictly speaking none. Its origin is in the uncontrolled fighting spirit of the army. The military spirit is laudable and essential, "but above the military spirit, guiding and restraining it, should stand the

higher spirit of the statesman, which, without fearing danger, knows how to discern it." Without fear of contradiction it may be affirmed that had the Rs. 700,000,000 come out of the British taxpayer's pocket, opportunity would have been found for the requisite guidance and restraint. The *raison d'être* of Quetta and the most damaging contention against its prolonged existence is that it is "a large and ever present opportunity." It is not and cannot be a final position but merely "a stepping-stone to a better (?). Kandahar may realize our ideal, or Herat, and at least there will be more chance of a fight with the Russians if we move seventy-four or still better four hundred and seventy-four miles nearer to their frontier than we are to-day." At any rate, even if Russia wisely keeps beyond our reach, we shall be sooner or later landed in a war with Afghanistan. All this is an excellent commentary on the scare created by the *Times* last summer in connexion with the new Russian railway on the Afghan frontier, and the significant mention of immense stores of railway material at New Chaman. The military situation created by this systematic aggression is undignified, unconstitutional, and financially intolerable. In spite of Mr. Balfour's confident predictions the army has been considerably increased since the Chitral campaign. The British forces in India are at present six thousand in excess of the sanctioned establishment, and the native army has been augmented in so disproportionate a degree that the ratio between European and native troops fixed as the minimum consistent with safety at the end of the mutiny has been largely diminished, while the latter tendency of British Government has been to excite rather than allay discontent with our rule. Under present conditions it is perfectly justifiable to speak of the Imperial Service Troops of the Native States, maintained at a cost of Rs. 6,000,000 annually, as a "gratuitously created danger," and to look upon the opportunity of their abolition as a distinct gain. At this moment 14,000 British troops; 18,000 Native troops, and 114 guns are employed in watching the armies of the Independent States whose existence is justified only by the present frontier policy. Summing up, Colonel Hanna says:

"I have shown that the Forward Policy has added heavily to the burden of taxation borne by our Indian fellow subjects; that it has robbed the Provincial Governments of their balances; that it has filled the Native Army with untrustworthy Pathans and discontented soldiers of more loyal race; that it has destroyed that proportion between British and Native armed forces, without which there can be no safety for our rule; and that it has increased the independent Princes' power to injure us—in a word, that the cost of that policy has been to India the arrest of her development and the impoverishment of her inhabitants, and to Great Britain the weakening of the ties which have hitherto attached the bulk of the Indian people to her rule, and a marked decrease in her ability to cope either with civil or military disaffection."

These are not the words of a "little Englander" or an uncompromising advocate of economy, but of an officer who has served with distinction in India, went through the last Afghan war, and is thoroughly acquainted with Afghanistan and its people and with every aspect of the frontier question.

THE TENTH SOCIAL CONFERENCE.

THE annual meeting of the Social Conference proved a decided success. The attempt to revive the difficulties of last year at Poona met with a failure that one may hope will be final. In spite of it, the Conference assembled in the Conference pandal, and wisely exhibited in its proceedings the fullest harmony with the Congress. Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, who was President of the Poona Congress, came forward and congratulated the Calcutta Conference on its return to its old home, expressing the sensible and obvious opinion that the Conference was a valued and most necessary adjunct of the Congress. The Conference happily reciprocated the warm declaration of friendly and independent co-operation. "The Congress and the Conference," says the *Dnyan Prakash* most justly, "are sister institutions, one and inseparable, working in different though converging spheres." "The Social Conference," said the President with indisputable truth, "is a fitting corollary to the Congress." There is no reason in the world why the two bodies should not carry on their work effectively in different pandals: there is no specific virtue in a pandal. But, for all practical purposes, it would be a very absurd proceeding to set up different pandals; and the severance of established companionship would be interpreted as a sign of discord. In the eyes of all rational lovers of their country's welfare, discord is the one thing that must be sedulously avoided—discord, and even the merest possible suggestion of discord.

"All your strength is in your union,
All your danger is in discord."

Mr. Justice Ranade's address at the preliminary meeting, while giving interesting particulars of the progress of the movement throughout India, was interspersed with remarks of gravity and wisdom. The Conference owes more than can be set forth in a catalogue of items to the conduct and energy of the distinguished judge, who steadily exhibits the vigilance, moderation, and patient and large views of the wisest statesmanship. There is nothing more noteworthy than his explicit enforcement of the great fundamental principle of the State's dependence upon the quality of the individual citizen—a principle that seems to be too often overlooked by Western

statesmen, who think they understand their craft better than the men of the East. Mr. Justice Ranade acknowledged amply the importance of political action, such as is the main concern of the Congress. But that alone, indispensable and valuable as it is—and we, of course, should be the very last to undervalue it—is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the national development. “The State,” “after all,” says Mr. Justice Ranade, “exists only “to make individual members composing it nobler, “happier, richer, and more perfect in every attribute with which we are endowed; and this perfection of our being can never be insured by any “outside arrangement however excellent, unless the “individual member concerned is in himself prepared in his own private social sphere of duties to “co-operate in his own well-being.” This appeal goes to the very roots of the virtue of citizenship and the mystery of statecraft. It is a message that is no less valuable to Englishmen at home than to the natives of India. And it is noteworthy that it comes ringing across the ocean from India itself, where we are officially taught to understand that there is no real political ability except what we export from England. Let us add some of Mr. Justice Ranade’s summary remarks:—

“What is the inner spring of action which is setting in motion both orthodox and reform workers against their will, even where their will does not consent to move? That inner spring, hidden purpose not consciously realized in many cases, is the sense of human dignity and freedom, which is slowly asserting its supremacy over the mind. It is not confined to one sphere of family life. It invades the whole man and makes him feel that individual purity and social justice have paramount claims over us all, which we cannot ignore long without being dragged down to a lower level of existence. This or that particular reform or revival of ancient practices as some would like to call them, the removal of this or that particular defect or vice, is not, and should not be, the only end and aim of the agitation to improve our social condition. The end is to renovate, to purify, and also to perfect the whole man, by liberating his intellect, elevating his standard of duty, and perfecting all his powers. Till so renovated, purified, and perfected, we can never hope to be what our ancestors once were, the chosen people to whom great tasks were allotted, and by whom great deeds were performed. Where this feeling animates the worker, it is a matter of comparative indifference in what particular direction it asserts itself, and in what particular method it proceeds to work. With a liberated manhood, with buoyant hope, with a faith that never shirks duty, with a sense of justice that deals fairly to all, with unclouded intellect and powers fully cultivated, and lastly with “a love that overleaps all bounds, renovated India will take her proper rank among the nations of the world and be the master of the situation and of her own destiny. This is the goal to be reached; this is the promised land.”

The noble ideal so eloquently outlined by Mr. Justice Ranade was consistently kept in view by Babu Narendra Nath Sen, in his able and wisely practical address from the chair at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Sen particularly urged that “social reform

“should be carried on on strictly national, that is, “Aryan and Shastric lines,” that they should “proceed with caution and make no attempt to introduce violent changes in the social organisation,” and that they should “show extreme tolerance for “the opinions and feelings of those who differ” from them on the subject. There were eleven resolutions discussed and passed. We cannot cite them textually, but it may be instructive to refer to their substantial contents. The amazing thing to Englishmen will probably be that such points should require any discussion whatever, or that anyone should have thought of “violent changes” in connection with any of them. But in India practical religion has got so intimately entwined with everyday life that the utmost caution and patience are necessary. The promotion of “friendly feeling “between people of different races and belonging to “different creeds,” of all efforts that favour temperance, of religious and moral education “so as to “counteract, to some extent, the evil complained of “about the present Western education being too “secular in its character,” and of the “education “and social amelioration of the pariahs and the “other out-castes in all parts of India”—these points need no comment; they commend themselves by the simple statement. So does the resolution in favour of the publication of full accounts of the principal receipts and expenditure, and the enforcement of a proper administration, of religious endowment funds. The Conference deprecates the excommunication of travellers beyond sea that conform to the rules of Hindu society on their return; and the warm urgency of this point a few years back has had its effect in wider relaxations of the stringent rule. Mr. Justice Ranade’s statistics show no fewer than 167 Hindu students in England at the present time, and the judge insists that such pilgrimage for study “must inevitably take place,” and that the people at home “will be wise in their generation, who “remove the thorns from the ways of the young “pilgrims and welcome them back on their return.” The rest of the resolutions relate to the position of women. The Conference is undoubtedly right in putting into the very forefront of their programme the extension of female education; and it is worth while to quote the exact terms expressing the methods in contemplation:—

The best way is (1) to proceed on national lines by employing in female schools teachers of good character and descended from respectable Hindu families; (2) to establish training schools to secure a sufficient number of qualified female teachers; (3) to open home classes for grown-up ladies who cannot attend regular schools, with extra female teachers to visit and help at stated intervals, such ladies as read at their homes; (4) to employ a Pandita versed in Sanskrit to read passages from the Puranas and impart religious and moral instruction to ladies; (5) to take steps to publish text-books

suited to the requirements of female schools; and (6) to impart instruction in needlework, hygiene, culinary art, domestic economy, and training of children, in secondary schools.

What do English folk think of this? Can they adequately realize what such a reform means? A reform, we say, for it is actually set forth in the first of the Conference resolutions. To Indians the changes foreshadowed are far more serious than Home Rule or Disestablishment is to Englishmen, and, indeed, incomparably more so. Yet to Western experience they seem changes that might instantly be taken for granted. The reduction of marriage expenses, the discouragement of child marriage, and the removal of obstacles to the re-marriage of child widows, are finding a steadily increasing support, varying in different regions of the country. Finally the Conference "strongly denounces" polygamy "as at once degrading and pernicious in its consequences," and strikes specifically at Kulinism with all its monstrous abuses. There is not a single proposal in the programme that is not, to the Western mind, obviously just and right, as well as moderate, even to the point of absurdity or incredibility. Still, as has been said, the Conference does most wisely to proceed with caution. It must, on pain of disaster, take the feelings of the general community along with it, not captive, but willing on personal conviction. The leaders, it is obvious, may be fully trusted after ten years of admirable inspiration and guidance.

TREVELYAN'S LIFE OF MACAULAY.¹

If Solon had lived in modern times, his famous maxim would perhaps have taken a different form; it would not have been "Call no man happy till he dies," but "Call no man happy till his biography has been published." And (let one Herodotean story have leave to recall another) if Lord Macaulay had retained any vestige of the old belief in a Nemesis waiting upon good fortune, he would surely, as he approached the close of his wonderfully fortunate life, have sacrificed, like Polycrates of Samos, his most prized possession, lest the jealousy of Heaven should overtake him after death in the shape of a bad biography. But Macaulay was more fortunate than Croesus or Polycrates; his life was happy to the last, and it has been commemorated in a biography which by general consent is placed among the first three in the English language. Most of his good fortune he thoroughly deserved; of this precise form he was a little undeserving. Had he not borne

false witness of Boswell, propounding the characteristic but untenable paradox that the worthlessness of the writer caused the worth of his book? But Fate, more magnanimous and forgiving than the ancients imagined possible, allotted him for his biographer the man of stainless honour, the scholar and gentleman, whose withdrawal from politics, announced at the beginning of last month, has caused the profoundest regret to men of all parties. English public life is indeed perceptibly the poorer for Sir George Trevelyan's retirement; it is still permitted us to hope that English literature may be the richer, and that "the bridle of Theages" which has checked a political career may not be a serious obstacle to biographical and historical study.

Sir George Trevelyan himself reminds us somewhere that Dr. Johnson defined the qualification of a biographer as the ability "to write trifles with dignity." How exactly the sentence expresses the charm of Sir George's own book! No fact that helps us to see Macaulay in his habit as he lived is too trivial to be mentioned—his inability to sharpen a razor, for instance. And yet dignity is never sacrificed; the hero is not less of a hero because we have learnt a secret that might have been known only to his valet. To many the most delightful pages of all will be those that tell of Macaulay in his unrestrained frolicsome intercourse with his nephews and nieces. He was "the ideal uncle," confesses Mr. Leslie Stephen, otherwise a somewhat severe critic, "the uncle of optimistic fiction." And what a fascinating glimpse, by the way, of the future biographer is afforded in one of these avuncular stories, told in a letter of Macaulay's own! He had taken "Georgy" with two other children to the National Gallery. The others assumed airs of connoisseurship, "Georgy" only avowed weariness. "When I put him into the carriage, he said, half sulkily: 'I do not call this seeing sights. I have seen no sight to-day.' Many a man who has laid out thirty thousand pounds on paintings would, if he spoke the truth, own that he cared as little for the art as poor Georgy."

For Indian readers the most interesting portion of these volumes will naturally be the chapter that tells, with the assistance of copious extracts from his letters and journals, the story of Macaulay's life in India from 1834 to 1838. His biographer calls the Indian episode "the most important circumstance in Macaulay's life." His appointment to a place on the Supreme Council, as the one member of the board who was not a servant of the Company, was indeed of importance in more ways than one. It changed his whole career; it took him out of the main stream of English politics, into which he never returned, and it gave him such a competency as left him free, on his return to England, to devote

¹ "Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay." By Sir G. O. Trevelyan. New Edition. (London and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.)

himself to literature without anxiety about himself or his family. But Macaulay's three years in Calcutta are not without an importance of another kind. He rendered great services to India, both directly and indirectly; directly by his work upon the Penal Code, and by the strong, lucid and persuasive common sense of his minutes on education, the freedom of the press, and other subjects; indirectly by the brilliant historical essays which interested the mass of his fellow-countrymen at home in their great dependency as they had never been interested before. "The task of interesting Englishmen in the details of Indian administration," says his biographer, "is an undertaking which has baffled every pen except his own." It is to be feared that the sentence still requires little qualification, as regards the generality of English readers, in spite of the splendid work done since Macaulay's time by Sir William Hunter and others. The story of the violent agitation got up against Macaulay in the Calcutta press, and of the hole-and-corner meetings held to denounce him, is amusing and instructive reading even at the present day. One can well understand that neither the incisive clearness nor the obvious truthfulness of the following remarks commended them to the persons most nearly concerned:

"The political phraseology of the English in India is the same with the political phraseology of our countrymen at home; but it is never to be forgotten that the same words stand for very different things at London and at Calcutta. We hear much about public opinion, the love of liberty, the influence of the Press. But we must remember that public opinion means the opinion of five hundred persons who have no interest, feeling or taste in common with the fifty millions among whom they live; that the love of liberty means the strong objection which the five hundred feel to every measure which can prevent them from acting as they choose towards the fifty millions; that the Press is altogether supported by the five hundred, and has no motive to plead the cause of the fifty millions."

Socrates, with his perpetual enquiries for definitions, could not have been more distasteful to the Athenians than Macaulay must have made himself to the English in Calcutta by the merciless logic of such writing as this. From Socrates to Sir John Seeley, scientific thinkers have insisted on the importance of clear notions of the meaning of abstract terms like "law" or "liberty." The misfortune is that we do not always want these clear notions; they have a way of making us very uncomfortable.

To the student this book is nothing less than an inspiration. It is permeated with the love of literature, a love felt as deeply by the biographer as by the subject of the biography. Lord Macaulay's own criticisms, scattered through the volumes, are intensely interesting and suggestive. But the chief stimulus comes not from the criticisms but from the example. Few, if any, can hope to emulate the

amazing rapidity with which he possessed himself of the contents of a classic. The list of books that he read and re-read at Calcutta excites despair rather than emulation in the average mind. But the deep solace that he found in the reading of great authors is a joy within the reach of all of us. "That I have not utterly sunk under this blow," he writes after the death of his youngest sister, "I owe chiefly to literature. What a blessing it is to love books as I love them—to be able to converse with the dead, and to live amidst the unreal. . . . I have gone back to Greek literature with a passion quite astonishing to myself. I have never felt anything like it."

Incidentally, the passage just quoted is testimony to another quality of Macaulay, which is strongly brought out in this biography—the deep affectionateness of his nature. His love for his sisters meets us at every turn. To his love of children allusion has already been made. Of his care for those who were in any way dependent upon him let one instance suffice. When he received his Indian appointment he proposed to offer to keep his clerk in his service. "I cannot bear the thought," he wrote, "of throwing any person who has been about me for five years, and with whom I have no fault to find, out of bread, while it is in my power to retain his services."

In the twenty-one years that have elapsed since the first publication of this memoir, Lord Macaulay's fame, both as a man and a writer, has been subjected to much severe criticism. "Every schoolboy knows" by this time the faults of his literary style. As a historian, despite his elaborate pains, he stands convicted of many shortcomings from the point of view of his successors. He suffered from "a constitutional incapacity for not making up his mind"; he falls short of the modern standard of impartiality. The late Mr. Cotter Morison, a genuine and appreciative admirer of Macaulay's rhetorical skill and skill of construction, remorselessly exposed the want of philosophic depth in the history and in the man. "His intellectual force," says Mr. Stephen, "was extraordinary within certain limits; beyond those limits the giant became a child." The want of spirituality, again, in Macaulay's nature has jarred upon many thoughtful readers. But with all his faults he was great and loveable. Let those call him "prig" and "Philistine" who find a pleasure in so doing; but let us remember that the day may come and is perhaps not distant, when England will need the qualities whose less lovely side provokes the superfine into using their alliterative epithets. Is a splendid rectitude (to name only one of Macaulay's obvious characteristics), shining transparently through every action of a strenuous life, so superabundantly common that we should wax intolerant of it, if we fancy it is sometimes a little too conscious of itself?

OUR LONDON LETTER.

As we go to press an important memorial from Durban, with reference to the disgraceful treatment of British Indian subjects in South Africa, reaches us. On this subject, Mr. Chamberlain has made what at first blush looks like an amazing confession of impotence. It comes apparently to this, that while the British Government would hotly resent the maltreatment of British subjects in any foreign country, they are powerless in face of such maltreatment in a British colony, where *a fortiori* one would expect them to intervene. It seems that while the arrivals of Indians at the Cape are diligently chronicled, the return of Indians to British India are studiously ignored in certain quarters. If the purpose of these tactics is to inflame hostility against the Indians, it is certainly fulfilled, for we have news of a scandalous conspiracy, joined even by members of the volunteer force, to resist the landing of Indians. We may mention that throughout the past year Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been in regular correspondence with Mr. Chamberlain on the whole subject, which we shall set forth in some detail in our next issue.

The Earl of Northbrook, who was Viceroy of India from 1872-76, gave evidence before Lord Welby's Commission on February 3rd. On the subject of the payment of troops sent out to India he said:—

"I think that India has been hardly treated in this matter. For instance, it was not right to charge India with the ordinary expenditure of the Abyssinian expedition. The extraordinary expenses were a little over seven millions, and the ordinary expenses were not more than £600,000; and in the case of war with Abyssinia, I do not see what interest India has in the matter. In the correspondence last year between the Treasury and the Indian Government, the former admitted that no charge should have been made upon India for the Abyssinian war. I cannot conceive how it could be held by any reasonable person that the charge of the Abyssinian war should be laid upon India. You could not say that a port in the Red Sea was concerned in the matter. As to the Egyptian operations in 1882, I had a great deal to do with the arrangements, and therefore I should not like to give any very strong opinion against those arrangements. There was no doubt that as regards the keeping of the Suez Canal open India had an interest. In the first instance, it was intended that India should pay the whole cost of the expedition. That was when it was supposed that some very small force would be sufficient. The English Government had been put to a great cost. The expedition cost £1,700,000, and the ultimate arrangement made was that India paid £1,200,000 and England £500,000. In that matter India was hardly treated fairly, and it would have been better if India had only paid one-half. As to the sending of troops to Suakin in 1885 and charging India with them, I think that is a very bad case."

Lord Northbrook, in the course of his subsequent evidence, said that India had been inequitably and in some cases illegally treated in past years, and he did not see why the injustice should not be redressed.

"He suggested that in future cases, the Government of India should be the party to decide whether there were or were not direct and substantial Indian interests involved. A similar opinion had been advanced by Lord Cross in 1887, and by Sir Henry Fowler more recently. He did not think an Act of Parliament would be necessary in order to put the matter on a satisfactory basis, but suggested that the better course would be to proceed by means of a Treasury Minute approved by the Cabinet and by the India Office. He objected to any statutory arrangement. He agreed that it would be better if in the Treasury Minute some definition of what was meant by 'direct

and substantial interest' were given. It might be possible to lay down some area in regard to which Indian interests might be involved, such as from the Suez Canal to Singapore, or something of that kind."

Sir Henry Brackenbury, on February 15th, gave some interesting and important evidence, before Lord Welby's Commission, with reference to what would be done in case of a European war, or of India's being threatened with invasion by Russia. The basis of the military charges on India was, he said, the theory that India should repay what England would not pay but for the military requirements of India, subject to some sort of rebate. That theory was altogether wrong. The strength of the Army in India was calculated so as to allow of a powerful field army being placed on or beyond the Indian frontier in addition to the obligatory garrisons required for keeping order in India. The necessity for maintaining in India that powerful field army was called for by the approach of a great military power into a position which enabled her to threaten directly Afghanistan (to which they were under treaty obligations) and indirectly to threaten the security of India. The object of British foreign policy, generally speaking, was to secure Great Britain's rule over her Empire. If it were desired to maintain British rule in India only for India's sake, then it would be fair to make India pay everything which could be shown was due to Britain's rule over India. But Britain's interest in keeping India under the British rule was enormous. India employed over 200,000 Britons, and millions of British capital, and India's commerce was of immense value to Great Britain. Under those circumstances, in estimating the share that India should pay, England should be generous because she was rich and India was poor, and, further, because India was practically arbitrarily governed.

Sir H. Brackenbury added that the condition of things now in India was so absolutely changed from the time of the Indian Mutiny that the army in India maintained out of Indian revenues was amply sufficient to deal with any revolt or mutiny without calling for more troops from England. Therefore, he ruled, all help to India as being out of the question. If there was any imminent probability of war with Russia England would not send one soldier either to Russia or elsewhere until she had completely established supremacy at sea, and was free from all possible danger of attack.

Captain Chalonor has given notice that he will on the 18th March call the attention of the House of Commons to the grievance of the Officers of the General List (Indian Army) in the matter of their pensions; and to move that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to enquire into their case.

Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett has given notice that, on March 2nd, he will call the attention of the House of Commons to "the great advance of Russian power in North-East Asia and generally," and will move a resolution.

We are glad to see that our spirited young contemporary, the *New Saturday*, is taking up Indian problems in no half-hearted fashion. In its issue of January 30th it printed a vigorous leading article

upon the debate on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the address. We take the following extract from an article which ought to be read with interest throughout India:—

"The official position was authoritatively presented by the present and late Indian Secretaries, reinforced by a former Governor of Bombay, and by Mr. Bhownagsee, of Bethnal Green, who has at last come out in his true colours. It is not enough to say that Sir Henry Fowler agrees with Lord George Hamilton; he ostentatiously out-Hamiltons Hamilton. By the calendar, he appears to have been Liberal Secretary for India; yet, in point of utterance, he seems to be more Conservative than Lord Cross, and hopelessly to outdistance the late Lord Iddesleigh. Things are getting too mixed in this department. The man in the street will presently want to know what is the hidden meaning of such remarkable unanimity and fervour. And, in fact, the sooner he enquires into it the better. His representatives do not appear to care a brass farthing for the business; the debate could hardly hold a House together—it might have been the Indian Budget that was on. But what strikes us as the most serious point of all is this, that there was no man there to handle the two Indian Secretaries as they deserved.

Here is another extract from the article in the *New Saturday*:—

"The second point is a word of regret that Lord George Hamilton should have been weak enough to rail so wildly against the National Congress. What though the amendment did 'emanate from the National Congress?' 'That body,' he dared to say, 'never loses an opportunity of attacking the Indian Administration and of endeavouring to diminish the influence of that Administration over the people of India.' The assertion is simply a perversion of dislike. Two Viceroy and two Indian Secretaries—not of one political colour either—have strongly testified to the loyalty and usefulness of the Congress. The Congress may have its featherheads and windbags, like other big associations of men for political purposes (including the House of Commons itself), but its resolutions are steadily, if slowly, getting incorporated in the statute book. And that is a notable symptom."

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

NEARLY THREE MILLIONS ON RELIEF.

NOTES AND NEWS.

The latest weekly telegram from the Viceroy before we go to press states that the total number of persons on relief is now 2,948,000.

The most recent issue of the *Gazette of India* to hand publishes the following table, showing the total number in receipt of relief in all Provinces during the weeks ending January 23rd and January 30th:—

NAME OF PROVINCE.	RELIEF WORKS.		GRATUITOUS RELIEF.		TOTAL.	
	For week ending.		For week ending.		For week ending.	
	23 Jan. 1897.	30 Jan. 1897.	23 Jan. 1897.	30 Jan. 1897.	23 Jan. 1897.	30 Jan. 1897.
1. Madras	20,833	26,452	8,096	6,974	28,841	33,426
2. Bombay	256,901	281,163	7,896	11,082	261,897	292,245
3. Bengal	233,846	247,327	44,423	70,843	278,269	318,170
4. N.-W. Provinces and Oudh	645,968	790,220	149,725	234,134	795,693	1,024,354
5. Punjab	53,361	62,227	16,370	20,719	69,731	82,946
6. Central Provinces	206,082	202,979	22,210	39,063	228,292	242,042
7. Burma	24,379	26,155	5,937	5,998	30,316	32,153
8. Central India	8,642	36,596	8,162	4,193	42,504	40,789
9. Rajputana	25,620	18,733	2,890	1,510	28,510	20,243
Grand Total	1,506,132	1,692,182	271,499	394,766	1,777,631	2,086,948

In this connexion we may quote the following paragraph (No. 6) from Lord G. Hamilton's despatch to the Viceroy, dated January 15th:—

"The number of people in receipt of relief during the first week in January was 1,200,000, of whom about 248,000 were receiving gratuitous relief. It is expected that these numbers will increase until April; during March and April pressure will, it is hoped, abate in tracts where the spring harvests on large areas prove good; but in some parts the numbers on relief may go on increasing until the end of May. And in no case will anxiety be over until favourable rains have fallen in July or August next."

On February 23rd the Lord Mayor's Fund at the Mansion House for the relief of the sufferers in India amounted to £341,000.

The total amount now collected by the towns and districts of Lancashire is upwards of £105,000. The cotton operatives' collections in many cases have only just begun, so that a continued rapid increase is confidently expected.

Meantime, affairs in regard to the cotton-weaving industry of north and north-east Lancashire have reached a critical stage. At a meeting of the Employers' Association recently held in Manchester, it was resolved to ascertain the opinion of the affiliated districts as to the advisability of seeking to obtain a reduction in wages to the amount of 10 per cent. The reason given was the great depression of trade, accentuated by the prevalence of the Indian famine.

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION.

St. James's Hall was thronged on February 10th from floor to ceiling for the great public meeting on the Indian famine organised by the Social Democratic Federation. A number of Indian gentlemen were present, both on the platform and in the body of the hall.

Professor H. S. BEESLY, who presided, said as to the argument that the holding of such a meeting was inopportune, what India wanted was justice—(cheers)—and the more the English people came to understand that they had been guilty of grievous wrong to India the more likely they were to make reparation. Their responsibility in taking the government of those 300,000,000 of people was so overwhelming and crushing that his desire was that they should give it up as soon as possible. (Cheers.) They were told they must come to the rescue of India, and contribute even in the Board schools—(shame)—in order to impress on the working classes the advantages of belonging to a vast Empire. If the state of India was due to her being squeezed during 100 years, they must help, but not again. If the people of these small islands were to make a common purse with 300,000,000 paupers the sooner they got rid of the Empire the better. It would be much simpler if the English managed their own business, and left the Indians to manage theirs. (Cheers.) There was not the least chance that either Social Democrats or Positivists would attain their ideals as long as the country was weighed down by her millstone of an Empire. (Cheers.)

Mr. MICHAEL DAVITT, M.P., moved the following resolution: "That this meeting of the citizens of London calls upon the Government to stop now and henceforth the drain of produce from India, officially certified at a value of more than £20,000,000, sterling a year, used to pay home charges, pensions, interest, etc., this drain having caused and now hideously intensifying the famine which is devastating British India." He said that the English seemed to think that their business was to manage everyone else's business—at a fair percentage. They had to deal with a serious problem—a calamity which had befallen their fellow-subject in India not for the first time. There was one curse afflicting India—the curse of English rule. (Cheers.)

Mr. R. B. CUNINGHAM GRAHAM seconded the resolution, declaring that the root of the evil was not so much the inherent faults of British rule, as the supremacy of the capitalistic system—cheers—which bound together in one chain of misery the people of England, of India, of Ireland, and the peoples of the whole world, where one class labours, and another enjoys the fruits. (Cheers.)

Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI said that he found no fault with the English people, except that they had laid down rules and principles and did not see them carried out. If their servants had betrayed their trust, the misery they caused must lie at the door of the English people. To the merchants and officials who exploited the country and carried away millions yearly India seemed very rich, but to the people who had been ground and ground without cessation for 150 years she seemed very poor. The English system was based on dishonour and hypocrisy. (Cheers.)

Mr. HYNDMAN, who was received with three hearty cheers, declared that in September and October the district officials in India had sent in reports of the beginning of the famine. Those reports were suppressed in Calcutta, and he challenged Lord George Hamilton to deny it. The action of the Government was first to conceal and then to minimise the greatest calamity that had ever befallen India. The Famine Fund had been expended in frontier wars that were ruinous to the people. Every day in every year people were dying of starvation, but four or five hundred thousand deaths were never heard of; when they died by millions, it became a little serious, because they could not get taxes out of corpses. (Cheers.) He appealed to the people not only to stop the drain from India, but to introduce a new system of government. (Cheers.)

The resolution was put and carried with enthusiasm. Other speakers followed.

The Social Democratic Federation have received the following letter from Lord George Hamilton, M.P., Secretary of State for India, in reply to their request that he should receive a deputation to place before him the resolutions passed at the meeting on the Indian famine at St. James's-hall on February 10:—

India Office, Feb. 18.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th inst., asking his lordship to receive a deputation to lay before him proposals adopted at a public meeting held at St. James's-hall on the 10th inst., to the effect that all payments made in this country in connexion with the Government should now and henceforth cease. The payments include pensions for services rendered, the maintenance of establishments for recruiting the civil and military branches of the Government of India, and the payment of interest upon monies lent to the Government of India for the building of railways and other works of public utility. Lord George Hamilton assumes that the meeting which passed this resolution did not propose as a mitigation of the distress and misery now caused by famine and plague in India the bankruptcy of the Government of that country.

"Upon the credit and financial resources of the Government of India is now imposed the obligation of saving life and counteracting the terrible consequences of the famine and pestilence, and the ruin of their credit means the death by starvation of many millions. Still less can the meeting desire to destroy the railway system of India, for upon the efficient working of the railways depends the transport of the food necessary to keep the people alive. The only intelligible meaning which it appears to Lord George Hamilton can be attached to the resolution passed and approved as a panacea against distress in India, is that the charges in question—namely, 17 millions sterling, should be transferred from the Indian to the Imperial Exchequer. This will involve, as a matter of course, increased taxation among the community in these islands to the same amount—namely, £17,000,000. This is not a question which Lord George Hamilton could discuss with the proposed deputation, and it is quite outside the scope of his department, and he therefore feels that no advantage would accrue from his meeting the deputation. It should, however, be clearly understood that the weekly drafts made upon the Indian Government by the Secretary of State are

regulated by the state of the cash balances in India, after they have met the full extraordinary expenditure and disbursements necessitated by the famine relief operations. If the balances are low, the bills here are reduced correspondingly, the difference being met by recourse to the borrowing powers possessed by the Secretary of State in Council, and Lord George Hamilton would point out that there is therefore no reason to fear the expenditure of the Government on the relief of the sufferers by the famine will be in any way curtailed by the necessity of discharging the financial obligations of the Secretary of State in Council in this country. "I am, &c."

"RICHMOND RITCHIE."

SIR W. W. HUNTER'S LEAFLET.

In connexion with the County, City, and University of Oxford Indian Famine Fund, Sir W. W. Hunter has drawn up the following brief leaflet, under the title, "Help for the Famine-Stricken Millions in India!" We understand that the leaflet is being extensively and usefully employed in the work of house to-house collection.

"The Famine raging in India is one of the most terrible calamities that ever afflicted mankind. The rain on which the crops depend has failed during successive seasons. The people have gradually eaten up their stocks of grain. About forty millions of men, women, and children, are now suffering from famine; and other forty-four millions will come within danger of famine if the summer rains again fail.

"Imagine eighty-four millions of peasants, or three times the whole population of England, deprived of the harvests on which they rely for their food! The British Government of India has for the first time in the history of the world made adequate provision for feeding such multitudes. About three millions are already entirely dependent on the Government relief works. But the utmost the Government can do is to provide a bare subsistence for these vast starving masses. The diseases which come with famine—cholera, fever, and now perhaps also the plague—will bring desolation and death into hundreds of thousands of homes.

"You are urgently begged to help the widows, and orphans, and aged and sick people who will thus be deprived of their bread-winners. Your aid is also asked for large classes of poor but respectable Indians, who have eked out their little stores in the hope of the crop which has now failed, and many of whom (especially the women) would silently starve to death rather than seek public relief. During famines under the native kings of India, the people used to sell their wives and sons and daughters for food. But slavery of any sort is prohibited under British rule, and your charity will take the place of this old slave-dealing in women and children.

"Every shilling that you give will keep a poor widow or an orphan for a week; every sovereign may save some bereaved family from being broken up; every hundred pounds will enable a whole village which has lost its plough-cattle and seed-grain to make a fresh start. If you can subscribe a hundred pounds, give them. If you can afford a sovereign or half a sovereign, give it. If you can only spare a shilling, give it in Heaven's name, for no offering carries a surer blessing than the charity of the working-man to the poor.

"You are asked to help the British Government of India in its great and difficult task; to make the bare subsistence which it provides for all, something more than a bare subsistence for those who need special relief; to help thousands sorely stricken by disease towards recovery; and to bring comfort and hope into thousands of homes left desolate by death."

A telegraphic message has been sent by the Central Committee of the Indian Famine Relief Fund to all the principal Continental towns and chief ports trading with India, to the Governor-General of Canada, the *New York Herald*, and the Mayors of American ports which do business with India. An appeal has also been made to South Africa, the Australian Colonies, Colombo, Penang, Singapore, Hongkong, Shanghai, and Yokohama. The message, which has been sent in the name of Sir Francis Mackinnon, Chief Justice of Bengal, runs: "Central Committee Indian Famine Fund, Calcutta, earnestly solicit your cordial co-operation; highest possible scope

private benevolence, outside State relief system; area numbers affected enormous; distress rapidly increasing; feel sure unavoidable privations millions industrious poor will arouse profound sympathy of all classes of all nations. Committee make urgent appeal to you to organise relief fund; will be deeply grateful for contributions which will be publicly acknowledged." A sympathetic message has already been received in reply from the Straits Settlements announcing donations amounting to 13,000 dollars which has been gratefully acknowledged by the Secretary of the Famine Fund.

The *Pioneer* gives some particulars regarding Famine Relief operations which are now being carried on privately and without any ostentation by a few Bengali gentlemen in Bonares. They have formed among themselves a small committee, who seek out, and personally distribute chappatties, parched gram and molasses to all the starving poor who daily congregate, or come to die on the chief ghats of the holy city. Rice and also attah are distributed in a private manner to the respectable poor whose position does not allow them to beg directly, and whose circumstances have become so reduced as hardly to enable them to obtain one full meal in two days. "There seems to be no doubt," says the *Pioneer*, "that these gentlemen are, quite independently of Government, doing excellent work; and it is to be hoped that their example may be widely imitated in other cities, towns, and villages. The resources of the Famine Fund might well extend help to any local efforts of this kind to any genuine efforts at self-help like this that are found in evidence."

OPINIONS FROM INDIA.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN'S amendment to the Address, asking for a Commission of Inquiry into the material condition of India, as suggested by the famine that has now settled on the land, stood but small chance of success out of hand, seeing that we have another big Commission still on hand. But on its own merits, nothing could be more reasonable than the demand made by the Hon. Member for Banfshire. An enquiry of this kind is inevitable, whether demanded by the Congress party or by an independent member. We cannot understand Mr. Bhownagari throwing cold water on it by expressing confidence in the work that is being done by the officials. That is worse than begging the question; it is blinking at a great fact, an imperative duty. Nor is it easy to follow Lord George Hamilton's remarks as to the Congress trying to weaken the hands of the Government. Such statements can have nothing to do with Sir W. Wedderburn's demand. That demand is for an enquiry, which, if properly conducted, would set at rest the question that has haunted responsible statesmen since Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji started it. But we see that statesmanship is a thing our Conservative friends are becoming shy of. Is the Secretary of State for India aware that in denouncing the Congress he has given the movement perhaps the most handsome *chut* it has yet received?—*Indian Spectator* (January 31st).

In another direction prompt action is desirable, with a view to relieve the financial pressure. Owing largely to the great personal interest taken in railway extension by Lord Elgin, the Government of India is committed to a construction programme, entailing an expenditure of thirty crores of rupees during the next three years. In ordinary times, it would be easy to justify a policy of vigorous extension of railways leading even to so vast an outlay as this. But the burden, which is very heavy for the Empire at her best, is peculiarly onerous at the present juncture. It is not too much to say that under existing circumstances, a determination to adhere fully to the scheme, involving the raising of a large loan in addition to that required for the Famine, might end in a serious financial crisis. . . . It may be hoped that now that the reality of the Famine has been fully and freely recognised at head-quarters, public opinion will not have once again to go in advance of the Viceroy in the recognition that cherished schemes of railway extension must give place to the great financial needs of a time of widespread distress.—*Bombay Gazette* (January 30th).

There is a Colonial Office in London. The Home Government paid £100,000 for its construction. The Colonies paid

nothing. For the construction of the India Office the Home Government paid nothing; but the poor, rack-rented, grievously assessed rayats of India, living sometimes in the days of scarcity upon tiger's flesh, paid £500,000 towards the building of this palatial edifice in the heart of the capital of the Empire! Then, again, the Home Government pays £41,000 a year for the Colonial Office in London. It does not pay a farthing towards the maintenance of the India Office. On the contrary, it would seem from the evidence given before the Royal Commission that if an adjustment of accounts were made, several crores of rupees would be owing to India. The justice of Mr. Hyndman's contention is beyond dispute; and probably Mr. Hyndman felt that a great occasion like the meeting of the Mansion House, which was attended by Royal personages standing so near the throne, and presided over by the Lord Mayor, was a suitable opportunity for striking a decisive blow for justice to India.—*The Bengalee*.

There are only two ways of saving India from the inevitable fate that awaits her. One is by the reduction of her expenditure, and the other, by making the English Exchequer help her in her chronic difficulty. The pro-Indian members of Parliament, from Mr. Fawcett downwards, had tried their best to secure economy in the administration of India. All that they got for their pains was only a Committee. This Committee sat for a few years and then produced a report, and the matter ended there. Even now a Royal Commission is sitting with the same object in view. . . . India, however, needs a prompt and substantial remedy. The only sure way of making the English people earnest is to touch their pockets. They would have been taxed for the purpose of maintaining the India Office if Mr. Hyndman's proposition had been accepted. And this would have no doubt created an uproar in England. The vast majority of Englishmen have very little interest in India, which is only a source of profit to an inconsiderable number of their community. India benefits only a few hundreds of civil servants, a few hundreds of merchants, and a few thousands of military men. To the rest of the English nation, India contributes nothing or very little.—*Amrita Bazar Patrika* (January 31st).

Last Thursday the *Times* wrote that no serious harm is done by the delay of a week or two in appealing to the British public, adding by way of explanation that the famine could not be dealt with in the spur, but was an affair of from six to twelve months' continuous exertion. Why the fact that the famine is likely to endure for months to come, should render it less desirable to collect the means of mitigating its effects with all possible speed is not clear. The truth is that so long as the Secretary of State supported the Viceroy the *Times* felt compelled to find arguments to the same purpose; but the moment Lord George Hamilton has acted on his own responsibility and asked the Lord Mayor to open an Indian Famine Fund, the leading journal discovers that the dangers of delay are overwhelming, and the Viceroy is thrown overboard. His Excellency's reasoning, it appears, "is admirable from the standpoint of statecraft," but "in practice" his policy is of doubtful "sagacity." And the attitude of sitting on the fence, while admirable from the standpoint of prudence, is of doubtful dignity when adopted by a paper with the authority of the leading journal in the case of a great Imperial emergency.—*Pioneer* (January 14th).

THE TWELFTH CONGRESS.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTIONS.

We print below the authorised text of Resolutions carried at the Twelfth Session of the Indian National Congress, which was recently held at Calcutta under the presidency of Mr. R. M. Sayani:—

I.—THE QUEEN'S REIGN.

This Congress desires to place on record its humble congratulations on Her Gracious Majesty,

the Queen Empress, having attained the sixtieth year of her reign, the longest and the most beneficent in the annals of Empire—a reign associated with the most important advances in human happiness and civilization. The Congress expresses the hope that Her Majesty may long be spared to reign over her people.

II.—THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

This Congress desires to convey to Sir William Wedderburn and the other members of the British Committee its most grateful thanks for their disinterested services in the cause of Indian Political Advancement, and accords its hearty welcome to Mr. W. S. Caine as the delegate of the British Committee to this Congress.

III.—JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES.

That this Congress notices with satisfaction, the support of public opinion both in England and in India, which the question of the separation of judicial, from executive, functions, in the administration of justice has received; and this Congress once again appeals, to the Government of India and the Secretary of State, to take practical steps for speedily carrying out this much needed reform. In this connection, the Congress desires to record its deep regret at the death of Mr. Manomohan Ghose, who made this subject his special study.

IV.—FINANCIAL DECENTRALIZATION.

Considering that the Local Governments are entrusted with all branches of administration excepting army expenditure, superior supervision and control here and in England, and payment of interest on debt, this Congress considers the allotments made to the Provincial Governments on what is called the provincial adjustments as being inadequate to meet the growing requirements of the different provinces; and that in view of the revision of the Quinquennial Provincial Contract, which is to take place in 1897, this Congress is of opinion that the time has arrived when a further step should be taken in the matter of financial decentralization, by leaving the responsibility of the financial administration of the different Provinces principally to the Local Governments; the Supreme Government receiving from each Local Government only a fixed contribution levied in accordance with some definite and equitable principle, which should not be liable to any disturbance during the currency of the period of contract, so as to secure to Local Governments that fiscal certainty, and that advantage arising from the normal expansion of the revenues, which are so essential to all real progress in the development of the resources, in the satisfactory administration of the different provinces.

V.—SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

That this Congress, concurring with previous Congresses, again records its deep regret that the labours of the Public Service Commission have practically proved void of any good result to the people of this country, and repeats its conviction that no satisfactory solution of the question is possible unless effect is given to the Resolution of the House of

Commons of the 2nd June 1893, in favour of holding the competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Services, viz. Civil, Medical, Police, Engineering, Telegraph, Forest, and Accounts, both in India and in England. This Congress would once again respectfully urge on Her Majesty's Government that the Resolution of the House of Commons should be speedily carried out as an act of justice to the Indian people and as the only adequate fulfilment of the pledges made to them.

VI.—THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

That this Congress hereby records its protest against the scheme of reorganisation of the Educational Service which has just received the sanction of the Secretary of State, as being calculated to exclude natives of India, even those who have been educated in England, from the superior grade of the Education Service to which they have hitherto been admitted; for the words of the Resolution are:—"In future natives of India who are desirous of entering the Education Department will usually be appointed in India and to the Provincial service." The Congress prays that the scheme may be so recast as to afford facilities for the admission of Indian graduates to the superior grade of the Educational Service.

VII.—TRIAL BY JURY.

That this Congress having regard to the opinion of the Jury Commission as to the success of the system of the trial by Jury, and also the fact that with progress of education a sufficient number of educated persons is available in all parts of the country, and, concurring with previous Congresses, is of opinion that trial by Jury should be extended to districts and offences to which the system at present does not apply, and that the verdicts should be final.

VIII.—THE SALT TAX.

That this Congress once again places on record its sense of the great hardship which the present rate of Salt tax imposes upon the poorest classes of the country, a hardship which renders it incumbent upon the Government to take the first opportunity to restore the duty to its level of 1868.

IX.—INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

That this Congress once again deems it necessary to record its most solemn protest against the disabilities imposed on Indian settlers in South Africa, and the invidious and humiliating distinctions made between them and European settlers, and appeals to Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India to guard the interests of Indian settlers and to relieve them of the disabilities to which they are subjected.

X.—THE MEDICAL SERVICES.

(a) That this Congress notices with satisfaction that its views in regard to the urgency and lines of reform in regard to the condition of the Civil and Military Medical Services of the country, are being endorsed in influential Medical and Military circles, and that in the interests of the public, the Medical Science and the profession, as also in the cause of economic administration, this Congress once again affirms

(1) that there should be only one Medical Military Service with two branches, one for the European army and one for native troops, worked on identical lines, and (2) that the Civil Medical Service of the country should be reconstituted as a distinct and independent Medical Service, wholly detached from its present Military connection, and recruited from the open profession of Medicine in India and elsewhere, with due regard to the utilisation of indigenous talents, other things being equal. (b) That the Congress further affirms that the status and claims of Civil Assistant Surgeons and Hospital Assistants require thorough and open enquiry with a view to the redressing of long-standing anomalies and consequent grievances.

XI.—“OMNIBUS” RESOLUTION.

That this Congress concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating:—(a) Persistent pressure by the Government of India on all Provincial Administrations to induce them to carry out in its integrity the excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104, and 105 of the Despatch published in the Gazette of India of March 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of effective local option; (b) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons in warrant cases to demand that instead of being tried by the Magistrate, they may be committed to the Court of Sessions; (c) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste or colour; to ensure the liberal concession of licenses wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle or crops; and to make all licenses, granted under the revised rules, of life-long tenure revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the Provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued; (d) The establishment of Military Colleges in India, whereat natives of India, as defined by Statute, may be educated and trained for a military career, as Commissioned or non-Commissioned officers (according to capacity and qualifications) in the Indian army; (e) The authorising and stimulating of a widespread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India; (f) The discontinuance of the grant of exchange compensation allowance to the non-domiciled European and Eurasian employees of Government; (g) The abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India; (h) The establishment of a High Court of Judicature and a Provincial Legislative Council in the Punjab; (i) That this Congress, being of opinion that the Government of India Notification of 25th June 1891 in the Foreign Department, gagging the Press in Territories under British administration in Native States, is retrograde, arbitrary and mischievous in its nature, and opposed to sound statesmanship and to the liberty of the people, again enters its emphatic protest against the same and urges its cancellation without delay.

XII.—THE FAMINE.

This Congress deplores the out-break of famine in a more or less acute form throughout India, and holds that this and other famines which have

occurred in recent years are due to the great poverty of the people, brought on by the drain of the wealth of the country which has been going on for years together, and by the excessive taxation and over-assessment consequent on a policy of extravagance, followed by the Government both in the Civil and the Military departments, which has so far impoverished the people that at the first touch of scarcity they are rendered helpless and must perish unless fed by the State or helped by private charity. In the opinion of this Congress the true remedy against the recurrence of famine lies in the adoption of a policy, which would enforce economy, husband the resources of the State, and foster the development of indigenous and local arts and industries which have practically been extinguished, and help the introduction of modern arts and industries. In the meantime the Congress would remind the Government of its solemn duty to save human life and mitigate human suffering (the provisions of the existing Famine Code being in the opinion of the Congress inadequate as regards wages, rations, and oppressive as regards task work), and would appeal to the Government to redeem its pledges by restoring the Famine Insurance Fund (keeping a separate account of it) to its original footing, and to apply it more largely to its original purpose viz., the immediate relief of the famine stricken people. That in view of the fact that private charity in England is ready to flow freely into this country at this awful juncture, and considering that large classes of sufferers can be reached by private charity only, this Congress desires to enter its most emphatic protest against the manner in which the Government of India is at present blocking the way, and this Congress humbly ventures to express the hope that the disastrous mistake committed by Lord Lytton's Government in the matter will not be repeated on this occasion.

XIII.—POVERTY, AND ITS REMEDIES.

That this Congress once again would desire to call the attention of the Government to the deplorable condition of the poorer classes in India, full forty millions of whom, according to high official authority, drag out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation even in normal years, and the Congress would recommend the following amongst other measures for the amelioration of their condition:—(1) That the Permanent Settlement be extended to those parts of the country where it does not exist at the present time, and restrictions be put on over-assessments in those parts of India where it is not advisable to extend the Permanent Settlement at the present time, so as to leave the Rayats sufficient to maintain themselves; (2) That Agricultural Banks be established and that greater facilities be accorded for obtaining loans under the Agricultural Loans Act; (3) That the minimum income assessable under the Income Tax Act be raised from five hundred to one thousand; (4) That technical schools be established and local and indigenous manufactures fostered.

XIV.—HIGHER EDUCATION.

That the time having come when greater facilities are imperatively required for higher education and

the proper development of the Indian intellect than what are at present offered by examinations alone, this Congress is of opinion that the Acts of Incorporation of the Universities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay should be amended so as to provide for the introduction of teaching functions and for a wider scope of learning, and so as to suit generally the requirements of the present day.

XV.—THE INLAND EMIGRATION ACT.

Having regard to the facility of intercourse between all parts of India and Assam this Congress is of opinion that the time has now arrived when the Inland Emigration Act I of 1882 as amended by Act VII of 1893 should be repealed.

XVI.—THE MADRAS AND BOMBAY GOVERNMENTS.

Having regard to the wisdom of the policy of appointing to the Governorships of Madras and Bombay, Statesmen from England to the exclusion of the Services in India, and in view to the utilisation to those Governors of the power of giving when necessary a casting vote allowed them by law, this Congress is of opinion that it is desirable that the Executive Governments of those Provinces should be administered by the Governors with councils of three members and not of two members as at present, and that one of the three councillors must be other than a member of the Indian Civil Service, and in view to carrying out the object without additional cost, this Congress would suggest that the officers commanding the forces of those Presidencies be declared members of the respective councils as the Commanders-in-Chief of Madras and Bombay were, before the Madras and Bombay Armies Act of 1893 was passed.

XVII.—LAND REVENUE SETTLEMENTS.

That this Congress enters its emphatic protest against the policy of Government, in provinces where the Settlement of Land Revenue is periodical, to reduce the duration of the Settlement to shorter periods than had been the case till now, and prays that the settlement should be guaranteed for long periods, at least for sixty years.

XVIII.—INDIAN PRINCES AND CHIEFS.

That in the opinion of this Congress it is desirable that in future no Indian Prince or Chief shall be deposed on the ground of mal-administration or misconduct until the fact of such maladministration or misconduct shall have been established to the satisfaction of a public Tribunal which shall command the confidence alike of Government and of the Indian Princes and Chiefs.

XIX.—REPRESENTATIVE IN THE CENTRAL PROVINCES.

That this Congress puts on record its emphatic protest against the retrograde policy of the Government of India followed last year in nominating a gentleman for the Central Provinces to the Supreme Legislative Council without asking local bodies to make recommendation for such nomination, and earnestly hopes that Government will be pleased to take early steps to give to the Central Provinces the same kind of representation that it has already

granted to Bengal, Madras, Bombay and the North Western Provinces.

XX.—LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

That this Congress desires to place on record its sense of satisfaction at the delegation by the Bombay Presidency Association of Mr. Dinshaw Eduljee Wacha, Joint General Secretary of the Congress, to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Expenditure, and the Congress has full confidence that Mr. Wacha will give accurate and adequate expression to its views on the questions which form the subject of Enquiry.

XXI.—MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

This Congress again expresses its full and unabated confidence in Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as the representative of the people of India and hopes that he will be re-elected by his old constituency of Central Finsbury or any other Liberal constituency.

XXII.—THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

That a sum of Rupees sixty thousand be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee and cost of the Congress Publication, INDIA, and also for the expenses of the Joint General Secretary's Office, and that the several circles do contribute as arranged, either now, or hereafter in committee, for the year 1897.

XXIII.—OFFICERS OF THE CONGRESS.

That this Congress reappoint Mr. A. O. Hume to be General Secretary, and Mr. D. E. Wacha to be Joint General Secretary for the ensuing year.

XXIV.—NEXT SESSION.

That the Thirteenth Congress do assemble on such day after Christmas Day 1897, as may be later determined upon, at Amraoti, Berar.

Reviews.

"ON THE FACE OF THE WATERS."

On the Face of the Waters. By FLORA ANNIE STEEL.
(London: William Heinemann.)

There is a pretty story of a reviewer who commended an epic as "one of the best epics produced during the present year." The expression, which provokes a smile when it is applied to an epic, is used every day of novels, and from some points of view reasonably enough. Not only is the out-put of novels enormous, but the consumption of them by the average reader is enormous too; and to attain a place in the first half-dozen novels of a year is to achieve a success which is not only pleasant and creditable to the writer but interesting to nearly all of us. But the very fact that we consume so many novels leads to a dangerous confusion of standards. The critic does not always make it clear to his readers, probably is not always clear in his own mind, whether he is giving relative or absolute praise; whether he is merely distinguishing a book from the cart-loads of printed-paper that pass for fiction or claiming for a novel the rare honour of literary immortality. For those honours are rare,

even in fiction; literary excellence, as Matthew Arnold would say, is *not* common and abundant. In spite of the vast yearly out-put of novels, it may be questioned whether good historical novels—to confine ourselves to one department of fiction—are much more numerous than good epics.

These remarks have been suggested by the tone which has been generally adopted by reviewers in speaking of Mrs. Steel's romance. "On the Face of the Waters" deserves most of the success it has won. It is distinguished from the common run of novels by its ambitious aim, and by the labour and ability that have gone to its making. That it has already passed into a fourth edition is a fact creditable alike to the public and its guides. Let so much be said ungrudgingly at the outset, to prevent misunderstanding. But when we find so accomplished a critic as "Q" felicitating himself on the prospect that thirty years hence it will redound to his credit that in 1896 he discerned the greatness of this romance, it seems a duty to protest that there are essential differences between "On the Face of the Waters" and the really great historical novels. It is an ill-natured criticism, the kindly "Q" will interpose, that extols the dead classics who have no need of our praise and snubs the living author who has his bread to earn. But surely the curse of literature, as well as of life, is that "Each day brings its petty dust, Our smothered souls to fill," and a reviewer's first and most sacred duty is to set a high standard, to test all work by the touch-stone of the great masters.

"I have not allowed fiction to interfere with fact in the slightest degree," Mrs. Steel writes in her preface, and her words are quoted with admiration by "Q" and other critics. "The reader may rest assured that every incident bearing in the remotest degree on the Indian Mutiny, or on the part which real men took in it, is scrupulously exact, even to the date, the hour, the scene, the very weather. Nor have I allowed the actual actors in the great tragedy to say a word regarding it which is not to be found in the accounts of eye-witnesses, or in their own writings." Of Mrs. Steel's untiring industry there can be no doubt whatever; she has the infinite capacity for taking pains that is at least one part or one way of genius. But is her method of writing historical fiction a sound one? A critic cannot refuse it his admiration, yet he may be forgiven for feeling the same doubt that has occurred to many a thoughtful spectator of the still more laborious work in painting of Mr. Holman Hunt. This conscientious study of details, this photographic realism, it has its merits, no doubt; but the signs of the workmanship are too obtrusive, the thought of the labour involved is almost painful. And in spite of all her elaborate study, perhaps because of it all, Mrs. Steel's narrative of the Indian Mutiny is by no means clear. As in the case of Carlyle's "French Revolution," you must know the events first, if you are to follow the pictures of them intelligently. Perhaps the baleful influence of Carlyle's style and method is visible, not certainly in any Carlylese distortions of language, but partly in this obscurity of the incidents, partly in repetition of key-notes or catch-words. "The cloud of dust on the road to

Meerut"—one wonders how many times this phrase is repeated; and there is iteration of less picturesque and helpful phrases too, cries of "Merciful heavens!" and the like, that lessen the power of situations they are meant to emphasise.

Mrs. Steel has done wisely, as "Q" has pointed out, in a criticism in *The Speaker*, to which reference has already been made, in creating fictitious characters for her protagonists and introducing historical personages only as secondary characters. Hodson, of Hodson's Horse, and John Nicholson, are graphically portrayed; but the real heroes of the book, Jim Douglas and Herbert Erlton, and the heroines, Mrs. Erlton and Mrs. Gissing, are unknown to history. Whether she quite succeeds in making the lives of her imagined characters profoundly interesting in themselves is a further question. If she does not, she fails as a novelist, though she may succeed as a historian. The main interest, certainly, for most readers, will lie in the historical narrative, in the fortunes of the siege of Delhi, in the humours of the sham court or the populace, in the vivid Eastern colouring. Yet the *motif* that runs through the story—sordid and unpleasant at first, but gradually tending to a nobler issue—of the fictitious characters, is worthier than present-day fiction too often shows. It is nothing less than the redemption of spoiled lives by heroic deeds. Douglas and Erlton are both men whom passion has led into sin and disgrace. The Indian Mutiny gave them a chance of redeeming themselves, and both were saved by it, one to die and one to live. As Robert Browning, in so many plays and poems, showed that in the most commonplace lives there may come a crisis in which the soul has to reveal, once for all, of what stuff it is made, so Mrs. Steel has conceived of the Indian Mutiny as presenting such a crisis to more than one sullied, but still redeemable, English soul. And in several scenes she rises to the height of her argument, especially in the fine scene where Herbert Erlton's body lies in his tent, making mute but eloquent appeal, like the souls of those who had sinned "but not irremediably" in Plato's vision of Tartarus, to his wife's forgiveness. Worthy, too, is the authoress's aspiration to bring nearer the time when the white race and the dark shall understand each other better, and, in the light of better understanding, learn to forget and forgive. "High failures," says the poet, "overleap the bounds of low successes." To point out that Mrs. Steel has still heights to conquer if she would become a great novelist is, after all, to pay her a better compliment than to congratulate her on the success of a season.

THE INDIAN VILLAGE COMMUNITY.

The Indian Village Community: examined with reference to the Physical, Ethnographic, and Historical conditions of the Provinces, chiefly on the basis of the Revenue-Settlement Records and District Manuals. By B. H. BADEN-POWELL, M.A., C.I.E. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co.)

We have already become pleasantly acquainted with Mr. Baden-Powell through his useful, though

somewhat brief, sketch of the "Land Revenue Administration in India," and we take it as quite natural that he should now go a step deeper and tackle the mysteries of the village Communities. The present ample and solid volume needs no apology for its existence; there is no truer word in it, or out of it, than that "in this department, at any rate, there is a distinctly vacant place." The vacancy, in fact, is all the more glaring from the inadequate attempts that have been made to fill it up. Sir Henry Maine, whom Mr. Baden-Powell still treats with all but fetishistic reverence, told his readers long ago that "no Indian phenomenon has been more carefully examined, and by men more thoroughly in earnest, than the Village Community." Yet what he himself proceeded to describe was, in his own words, not a specific institution, but "a typical form to which the village-communities appear to me upon the evidence I have seen to approximate, rather than a model to which all existing groups called by the name can be exactly fitted." Any abstract and unified conception of "the village" must lead to errors of a disastrous kind; and such baneful results are only magnified and canonized by prostration before a plausible authority. Mr. Baden-Powell's volume is most valuable simply because its main purpose is to give the facts. "I confess," he says, "to have felt more concerned about marshalling the facts of the case and setting forth the conditions under which those facts are found, than with elaborating arguments and conclusions." Now, it is just the facts and circumstances that are most urgently needed. All preceding conclusions are limited in value by the slenderness of the basis of fact whence they have been drawn. Mr. Baden-Powell, indeed, reaches certain conclusions of his own. He leaves still, however, "a distinctly vacant place." We shall look to him for a supplementary volume "elaborating arguments and conclusions." And when he resumes his pen for this great task, we trust he will keep before his eyes the trenchant method of Fustel de Coulanges in dealing with the theories of the origin of property in land.

The difficulties of the enquiry are numberless and most trying. Mr. Baden-Powell has cut a way through the jungle, more or less rough, but still a way. He has guided himself mainly by the Revenue Settlement Records and District Manuals. Now, the question at once arises, how far can such evidence be relied on? The men that drew up these documents may or may not have been careful as to the precise facts. They were almost without exception working under pressure, and probably the vast mass of such reports consists of materials gathered together, no man can say how or on what authority, by subordinates that may or may not have been careless, or ignorant, or insensible to historical and archaeological interests. If we remember aright, Mr. Baden-Powell speaks of these records with great respect in his book on Revenue Administration, and even assigns them a legal authority in the absence of proof to the contrary. Has Mr. Baden-Powell ever tried their lordships of Her Majesty's Privy Council with the evidence of a Khasra or a Wajib-ul-arz? True, legal proof is one thing, and historical proof is another. But, for all that, it is quite

plain that not a single Revenue Settlement Record or District Manual can be safely used for the purpose of investigation into the history and nature of Village-Communities without a vigorous testing of the circumstances of its origin. To deliver yourself to the authority of the writer without such a searching estimate is to shut your eyes and exclude yourself from the scientific field. On some such considerations we must regard the present volume as substantially pioneer work, good of its kind undoubtedly and exceedingly valuable in the existing state of the enquiry, yet in all essentials only of a provisional nature. We earnestly hope that the author will follow it up with a sharp critical examination of the materials, and with definite theories whether destructive or constructive. There is room for an epoch-making volume.

Mr. Baden-Powell, then, has amassed and marshalled a vast body of facts (subject to further criticism, as already said). He starts with the common view of the village tenures, and describes the two forms of village—*raiyatwari* and joint. Then follows a very pertinent and suggestive consideration of the geographical, physical, ethnographic, historical and customary conditions affecting the movement of agricultural tribes and their forms of land-holding. Geographical features, of course, do not explain everything; but the main points indicated by Mr. Baden-Powell certainly "had a very clear connection with the facts of the Aryan advance; the occupation of the Indus Valley, the early Aryan connection with Upper Western India by that route, and the subjugation of the Ganges Valley or Plain, as well as with the fact that no extensive Aryan movement south of the Vindhya took place." While indicating physical features that invite village formation, the author points out the absence of village groups in certain districts—the British Himalayan districts (Kangra, Kumaon, Garhwal), the West Coast (North and South Kanara, and Malabar), and the South Punjab. This is a very interesting point to work out. The ethnographic discussion is very full and important, especially the points of Aryan and non-Aryan custom. The insistence on a specially agricultural caste among the Hindus has largely tended to emphasize the view that Indian village institutions are essentially or mainly Aryan. Mr. Baden-Powell concludes that "it may be safely asserted that all the upper classes of Aryan origin had little feeling for agriculture, and that India does not owe to them either the introduction of settled cultivation or (directly) any particular policy or principle of land-ownership"—a conclusion coinciding with the view of Sir William Hunter, that "throughout five-sixths of the continent the actual work of tillage remained in the hands of the non-Aryan or Sudra races, and that even at a remote time husbandry would become as degrading an occupation in the eyes of the Aryan conquerors as the tending of sheep was to the Mosaii Pharaohs."

"From all that we know of the results of the Aryan invasion, the chief agent in producing varied forms of land-tenure must have been the introduction of a number of centralised governments, with the opportunities that they afforded for the growth of over-lordships, whether extending to considerable estates or to single villages. . . . Even in those Aryan villages that

were always held by cultivating fraternities from the first, the co-sharers, "democratic" though we may call them, and having no pretensions to any noble rank, still regarded themselves as holding the land on a superior tenure extending to the whole area of their possession, in a way that we do not observe among the humbler *raiyatwari* communities. And it may be convenient to add that the same feeling of superiority and of union was evinced by the Jat, Moslem, and other clans, who later formed similar settlements of joint-villages. . . . Aryan land holding, in the case of all the higher castes, had thus a natural tendency to the landlord form. Otherwise, we have no evidence whatever that the Aryan mind conceived any special form of village as such. . . . As to the earliest ideas of land holding among the Aryans, in the state of movement and constant warfare which the Vedic hymns represent, we do not find any direct or even covert allusion to any system of sharing the land conquered or occupied. . . . What is still more to the purpose is, that there is no mention in the much later *Laws of Manu* of anything like a joint-village or an area of land held "in common." This is the more remarkable because the joint inheritance principle is fully asserted. . . . As regards a general idea of title to the soil, or property in land, I am not aware of any direct declaration on the subject earlier than the mention of it in the *Laws of Manu*.

On these points Mr. Baden-Powell comes into collision with several of the best known exponents of the general thesis of collective ownership, and the whole question requires more detailed exposition and criticism. The special chapter on "The Tribe and the Village" is very useful, and in points incisive. The review of the various known origins of actually existing joint-villages, "apart from any general *a priori* theory," leads to the conclusion "that we have two great causes for union—(1) the existence of a tribal or clan stage of society with all that this stage implies, especially in the way of a right to share equally in the tribal acquisition; (2) the influence of the joint-family and its law of joint-inheritance; and to these we might perhaps add a third—voluntary association and combination." This review Mr. Baden-Powell follows up with an examination of the internal structure of joint-villages, exhibiting the minor variations and the modifications in the form of constitution. Thereafter he deals with the two types of village in juxta-position locally. Let us now present the substance of his general conclusion on the more important elements of the enquiry:

"I believe that individual ownership of the personally cleared and prepared holding in the tribal territory is quite consistent with the customs of tribal society at an early stage. Actual joint-property does not exist among the whole clan: at best, there is an appearance of collectivity caused by the common origin and close defensive and offensive alliance of the whole clan; by the equal right of everyone to share in the land obtained by the united exertion of the clan; and by the obligation to obey the patriarchal authorities, and to submit to that equalisation of holding in the tribal territory to secure which custom decreed that all holdings should be periodically exchanged. Actual joint-ownership is exhibited in the records of the Indian villages, as far as I can discover, only (a) among the families forming separated groups on a clean territory, (b) where there has been one owner of the whole village and his direct heirs continue to hold it without partition, (c) when the cultivation of an entire village has been undertaken by a group of colonists who prefer to arrange for each year, or cultivating season, what area or what fields each member shall take up, according to the number of hands, number of cattle, etc., he can bring to the work. . . . (d) It is also possible that particular plots of land may be always held in a sense jointly by a number of sharers, who may represent even an entire group of village owners, when there is some peculiarity, as for instance when a portion of village lands are along a river, and so are both liable to be washed away at one time and added to at another, and also to be exceptionally valuable, a little further inland, owing to the unfailling percolation of moisture. . . . If

there are other forms or cases of joint-holding, it will be very interesting to hear of them. . . . I have not met with any such.

The theory, then, that all joint villages begin with a "common ownership"; that this, by a process of natural evolution, goes on to strict shares; that, next, the shares become irregular; and, finally, that mere individual *de facto* holdings emerge, is distinctly contrary to the facts. It is based on a false generalisation from "joint-villages" of different kinds of origins; and it ignores the fact that when, in any given village, there has actually been a joint holding, followed by a partition into ancestral fractional shares, and these have been transformed into simple *de facto* holdings, the joint condition was not original, but consequent on a prior single title of the founder, grantee, &c., of the village; the joint holding was the result of the joint-succession (on ancestral shares) to that one founder. There is no progress of ideas, or evolution, in the matter.

Those students of early conditions that have committed themselves decisively to the collectivist view will dislike Mr. Baden-Powell's book exceedingly, and put their knife in it with a will. Those that wait for more materials and further verification will welcome it with no less cordiality as a noble contribution of facts and suggestions, to say nothing of the incidental criticisms of details, and the broad conclusions. It remains, we repeat, that Mr. Baden-Powell apply the same intellectual candour to the criticism of his authorities, and that thereupon he come to final conclusions on the Indian Village Community, and, so far as may be practicable, on the general question.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1897.

- BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. "The Indian Mutiny in Fiction." Lord Roberts's "Forty-one Years in India."
 CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. "The Mussulmans of India and the Sultan."
 MONIST. CURUS, Dr. F., "Philosophy of Buddhism."
 NINETEENTH CENTURY. Lubbock, Dr. Montague, "The Plague in India."
 NATIONAL REVIEW. Bear, W. E., "Food Crops and Famine in India." Wilkinson, Spencer, "Lord Roberts in Afghanistan."
 INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2 Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Padfield, Rev. J. E., "The Hindu Sacred Marks." Krishnaya, M. Venkata, "The Social Condition of Women in India." Umaiahankar, Lalshankar, "Female Education in Bombay."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1897.

- SHAH MENDEVI J. "History of the Armenians in India." (Luzac) 7s. 6d.
 MARKBY, SIR WILLIAM "The Indian Evidence Act." (Henry Frowde) 3s. 6d.
 "Proceedings of the United Planters' Association of Southern India, 1896." (Madras, Addison and Co) -- --
 FORREST, G. W. "The Famine in India." (Horace Cox) 1s. 0d.
 FRAZER, R. W., LL.B., I.C.S. "British India." (Fisher Unwin) 5s. 0d.

Printed by A. MONROE, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 24 and 25, Palace Chambers, London, E.W.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, E.C.4.]

VOL. VIII., No. 4.]
(NEW SERIES.)

APRIL, 1897.

[Subscription, Post-Free,
SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN.
IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	97	Three Anniversaries and a Contrast	115
The Cantonments Question Again, by Professor Stuart, M.P.	103	Longfellow	117
India's Economic Drain, by W. M. J. Williams ..	108	Our London Letter	119
Our Duty in India, by Donald N. Reid	106	Indian National Congress: Mr. W. S. Caiue's Return ..	120
Wanted: Technical Instruction	108	The Indian Budget	126
The Famine in India	110	Review: Medicine in India	126
"Military Enterprise and Aggression"	112	As Others See Us	128
The Indian Budget	113	Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects.●	128

Indiana.

ACCORDING to the most recent figures The Famine. which have been published the number of persons employed upon relief works in India amounts to 2,811,000, while the Mansion House Fund has reached £460,000. That is, in brief, the present position of the Indian famine as it appears to the casual reader of the newspapers. Lord George Hamilton, as will be seen from our Parliamentary Supplement, has not much to add to this information. He did, indeed, observe on March 9th, in reply to a question as to the mortality due to famine, that if the author of the question expected the present calamity to "pass over India without raising the mortality above the level which obtains in normal times," he stood alone in the expectation. Apart from this vague and indirect admission that the famine will probably cause some deaths, Lord George Hamilton is dumb. His private opinion probably is that members of Parliament who put questions on the subject are seditious agitators. They ought rather to say, as Sir J. Woodburn is reported to have said, somewhat mysteriously, in the debate on the Budget at Calcutta that, "while perfection could never be hoped to be attained, yet the Government of India had gained a measure of it." While the Government of India is congratulating itself upon gaining a measure of the unattainable, we continue to hear from India that the steps taken to combat the famine are inadequate, and the

wages paid on the relief works unduly low. The India Office apparently thinks that its duty at this moment consists partly in withholding information, and partly in excusing—which is sometimes the same thing as accusing—the Government of India. Fortunately, a large section of the British press is no longer content to accept this theory of its duties, and in many quarters we notice a strong determination to probe beneath the surface, and to enquire into the meaning of what is, after all, only a symptom.

Among the more vigorous protests against official optimism and superficiality may be mentioned two notable articles which appear in the *Progressive Review* and the *Positivist Review* for April. Professor E. S. Beesly, in a luminous and cogent article in the last-named journal, goes to the root of the matter when he says: "In India, or any other country, famine is the result not of drought, as Lord George Hamilton likes to think, but of poverty unable to make provision against drought. Therefore if it can be shown that British government is in any degree draining India of her wealth, it follows that in the same degree is British government the cause of Indian famine." Professor Beesly examines some of the topics which are familiar to our readers—such as the cost of Indian government, the drain of money to London in the form of pensions and other payments, interest on Indian debt, and so forth—and asks:

"What are we to think of a public subscription of half a

million to relieve distress in an exceptional year, when we are bleeding India every year to the extent of thirty millions? Even in this year of famine, every penny of the English claim on India will be exacted. 'Thou shalt want ere I want' is our motto. The interest on the debt will be forthcoming punctually. Every official in India or in London will receive the salary to which he is entitled. Lord Elgin will draw his Rs. 250,000, and Lord George Hamilton his £5,000. To meet the strain the debt will be further swelled; and, unless the new interest is to be paid out of new borrowings, new taxes must be devised for a people long since taxed to the uttermost and now suffering from exceptional distress."

The *Progressive Review*, writing in much the same strain, says—and we entirely agree—that the need of the situation is an exposure of the real meaning of British rule in India simple and vivid enough to catch the imagination of the people of this country.

"If Front Bench Liberals are going to stand in the way, so much the worse for them. Sir Henry Fowler is treading a perilous path; if he wants to reach the India Office again, to say nothing of any higher ambition, he will have to go more warily. The idea that, at this time of day, the House of Commons could be hoodwinked in regard to so old a grievance as the Famine Insurance Fund was quite fatuous."

Imperialism, the writer in the *Progressive Review* concludes, will be on its trial in various quarters during the next few years, and nowhere with more desperate stake than in India. All sober men will hope that another mutiny may not be needed to bring the famine-makers to their senses.

It may be interesting to reproduce here a brief analysis of the evidence recently given before Lord Welby's

The Progress of Expenditure. Commission on Indian Expenditure by Mr. H. Morgan-Browne, formerly Secretary to the British Committee of the Indian National Congress. Mr. Morgan-Browne's evidence may be summed up in the following seven propositions with reference to the accounts of the Government of India for the twenty-one years 1875-6 to 1895-6:—

1. That during the last twenty years the increase of net expenditure upon the civil and military services, apart from exchange, has far exceeded any increase in the cost of these services caused by the fall in exchange; while the additional cost of exchange accruing under other heads of net expenditure has been more than met by decreased expenditure under these other heads. The following is a summary of the figures:

	Rx.	Rx.
Increase in Civil and Military Services	13,150,000	
Add Increase in Cost of Exchange	7,750,000	
Total Increase		20,900,000
Decrease in other Expenditure	8,600,000	
Deduct Increase in Cost of Exchange	6,600,000	
Total Decrease		2,000,000
Net Total Increase.. ..		Rx. 18,900,000

2. That taking 1884-5 as a middle year, and altogether excluding expenditure due to exchange, the increase in civil and military expenditure in 1895-6 over that in 1884-5 was more than double the increase in such expenditure in 1884-5 over that in 1875-6. The following is a summary of the facts:

From 1875-6 to 1884-5 there was an increase in total net expenditure (excluding exchange altogether) of Rx. 3,000,000; from 1884-5 to 1895-6 the increase is Rx. 1,550,000. The increase of Rx. 3,000,000 during the former period is made up of an increase of Rx. 4,200,000 under the heads of civil and military services (including collection of revenue) and a decrease of Rx. 1,200,000 under other heads of expenditure; while the increase of Rx. 1,550,000 during the more recent period is made up of an increase of Rx. 8,950,000 in civil and military expenditure and a decrease of Rx. 7,400,000 in other expenditure.

3. That since 1884-5 the effect of the heavy fall in exchange has been aggravated by a large increase in the sterling expenditure of the Government of India and by other increase not automatic in its character.

	Rx.
Cost of Exchange on Increase in sterling Expenditure (£1,900,000)	1,600,000
Cost of Exchange Compensation Allowance (1895-6)	1,400,000
	Rx. 3,000,000

4. That from 1875-6 to 1884-5 the military expenditure of the Government of India (excluding exchange altogether) was almost stationary, but that since 1884-5 (again excluding exchange in any shape or form) there has been an increase of nearly Rx. 4,500,000 per annum.

5. That during the twelve years 1884-5 to 1895-6, over and above a large increase in ordinary military expenditure (i.e., army and military works), and excluding all charges on account of Upper Burma and the cost of frontier railways, special and extraordinary expenditure has been incurred to the amount of nearly Rx. 12,000,000.

6. That, generally speaking, and whatever may be the explanation, while the fall in exchange has been a disturbing factor of considerable magnitude, increased expenditure on the civil and military services apart from exchange has been a more important source of financial difficulty.

7. That some of the statements in the accounts of the Government of India relating to debt are misleading; that the set-off against ordinary debt of debt transferred to public works is improperly carried out in these accounts owing to the mixing of gold and silver debt without taking into account the varying rate of exchange between the pound and the rupee; and that therefore the Government of India are wrong in stating that the ordinary debt less that transferred to public works has decreased since 1884-5 by about Rx. 9,000,000—it has, in fact, increased by nearly Rx. 3,000,000.

The foregoing propositions summarise the financial memoranda issued by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, and we believe that not one of them was shaken in the course of Mr. Morgan-Browne's examination before the Royal Commission.

We print elsewhere a full report of the speeches delivered at the National Liberal Club on March 9th, Mr. Caine's Return.

on the occasion of Mr. Caine's return from the Twelfth Indian National Congress. The gathering was a large and representative one, and, while our

Indian readers will note with satisfaction the just and sympathetic temper which animated the proceedings, it may be hoped that the speeches of Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Harwood, and Mr. Caine will further dispel delusions once deplorably prevalent in the United Kingdom as to the method and the aims of the Congress. Sir W. Wedderburn, in proposing the health of the Queen, expressed the hope that India might not be forgotten in this year of celebrations. Mr. Samuel Smith, Lord Kinnaird, and Mr. Caine strongly urged that the United Kingdom would be neglecting its duty to India if it failed to make an Imperial grant to supplement the work of private charity and State relief in the hour of famine and pestilence. Needless to say, this proposal, excellent as it is, only touches the surface. What is infinitely more important is that justice should be done to India all round, and the first step towards that end is to welcome and appreciate the wishes and aspirations of Indians themselves. This, no doubt, is a difficult task. But in the Indian National Congress the Government of India, and the people of England, have an unrivalled index of Indian public opinion. Sir W. Wedderburn, who remarked the difficulty of governing so many millions of people so many thousands of miles away, urged the paramount importance of loyal and cordial co-operation between the Government and the natural leaders of the Indian people. Unfortunately men like Lord George Hamilton are for the moment more disposed to sneer at the Congress than to listen to it. The Secretary of State for India denounced the recent proposal for enquiry into the causes of famine as a proposal emanating from the Indian National Congress. But that fact, far from discrediting Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment, was its chief recommendation. Lord George Hamilton's knowledge of India is, to put it gently, imperfect. Sir W. Wedderburn was able to quote from Sir Richard Girth, formerly Chief Justice in Bengal, a description of the constitution and objects of the Congress which was based upon knowledge of the facts, and was, therefore, in the highest degree favourable.

Critics of the
Congress.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON not only accused the Congress of sedition—by which he means that it dares to offer criticisms and suggestions to the Government—but also taunted it with unreadiness to help in the work of fighting the famine. No taunt could have been more uncalled for, or more grotesque. The Congress, as Lord George Hamilton ought to know, is a deliberative assembly. Consisting as it does of representatives drawn from all parts of India, who meet together for its proceedings and disperse at

their close, it is little suited for executive work. But, as Mr. Caine aptly showed, the individuals who are prominent in the campaign against famine in their several districts are supporters of the Congress. They subscribe to the relief fund. They form the local committees. And, as Mr. Caine might have added, they are responsible for the careful and fruitful investigations of such bodies as the Bombay Presidency Association and the Deccan Sabha. Mr. Caine disposed of the charge of sedition by the simple device of reading the Congress resolutions. The allegation that the Congress is not representative is only less absurd. Popular election has as yet little scope in India. But wherever popular election is permitted, the people of India, as Mr. Caine said, "love to elect men who have proved their interest in their welfare by conspicuous service in the Congress movement." Mr. Caine's description of a Congress election in the market-place of Sholapur is a useful and striking answer to the wiseacres who talk of election as if it were a Western institution unknown to India and unsuited to her people. Mr. Caine was impressed, as every English visitor to India is impressed, by the passionate affection which is entertained for Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji among all classes of the Indian people. Mr. Naoroji, who reminded his hearers that the Congress is the offspring of British rule, and seeks to strengthen the connexion between Great Britain and India, has no objection to being told that he has the poverty of India on the brain. On the contrary, he intends to retain the malady, if malady it be, until the English people are aroused to a sense of their responsibility. Prince Ranjitsinhji expressed the hope that the cause of justice to India might not become the exclusive concern of Liberals. The remedy lies in the hands of Conservatives, whose co-operation is always invited, but who seem to be permanently under the spell of the party whip. Lord Kinnaird does not think (and we heartily agree with him) that the friends of the Congress need be discouraged because they meet with some opposition.

THE suggestion that a grant should be made from the Imperial Treasury to supplement State measures of relief in India has met with increasing support during the past month. It has, in fact, become a commonplace among public speakers and writers on the famine. Lord George Hamilton, however, in his reply to Mr. Buchanan on March 22nd, said that no application for assistance had been made by the Government of India, and her Majesty's Government did not see any reason to anticipate such an application by an offer of financial aid. In this connexion it may not be amiss to quote the words used by the Mahārājā of

Darbhanga in his speech in the Viceroy's Council, on March 26th, upon the Indian Budget :—

"For so long the burden has been exclusively borne by the Indian taxpayer that in the time of his need he may fairly appeal to the Home Government for a subsidy, and I am sure that he will not appeal in vain to the generous English nation, for his demand is based upon considerations of justice and equity. For England in the past he has made at least some pecuniary sacrifices, and to the English Government he may appeal for help in the time of pestilence and famine. I trust that your lordship's Government will see their way to press this view of the matter upon the attention of her Majesty's Ministers in England. The whole of India feels deeply grateful for the magnificent way in which the people of England have unanimously come forward to afford relief to the famine-stricken peasantry of this country. What I now request is that the English Government should supplement the good work performed by the generous English public. Any concession of this sort in a year like this will, I feel sure, not only be regarded with feelings of deepest gratitude by the thinking portion of the Indian public, but, what is more, it must go a long way to bind the two nations in closer bonds of union and love."

The Campaign
against
Ignorance.

Mr. ALFRED WEBB who was prevented by illness from attending the meeting on March 9th wrote, in the course of an inspiring letter, that "the general ignorance prevailing in the United Kingdom as to the Congress movement was deplorable." Every supporter of the Congress must agree with Mr. Webb in this opinion. At the same time, it is only reasonable to recognise that during recent years some impression has been made upon public opinion, and especially upon the newspaper press. Nobody who now compares the tone and the volume of references to the Congress in British newspapers with the tone and the volume of such references a few years ago can fail to notice the progress which has been made. The truth about the Congress is by degrees becoming known. Among other causes to which this result is due, we may mention especially the growing frequency of visits to India, and (a very different matter) the bitterness with which the Congress has been attacked. As an example of the first kind of influence we take the following extract from an article printed in the *Star* (March 27th) and written by an Englishman who recently visited India :—

"As to the Congress. On my way out I met with members of both the civil and military services who loathed the very word Congress. I also met with Englishmen who were going out chiefly in order to attend its meetings. In face of this conflict of opinion I desired to see and hear for myself, and therefore made a point of reaching Calcutta, where the meetings were held from 28 to 31 December. I am bound to say, as the result of my own observation, that if India is to be allowed to have an opinion upon matters in which she is mainly concerned (and no Liberal, at any rate, would refuse that right to her) it is difficult to imagine that such opinion could be expressed with greater moderation, ability, and loyalty to the English rule than at the recent Congress. Here

was a gathering of upwards of one thousand delegates, the picked men from all parts of the country, reinforced by about five times that number of visitors. . . . It is impossible here to speak of the detailed resolutions, about twenty in number, which were all carried with entire unanimity. The fact is that before a question reaches the Congress stage it has been threshed out elsewhere, and only those subjects are admitted about which there is fairly general concurrence. A special feature this year was the larger adherence of the Muhammadan community, a distinguished member of which opened the proceedings in a speech of more than three hours' duration, and presided over all the meetings with marked ability. The official class does not love the Congress or its leaders. But perhaps the future historian of India will say that at the present stage of development the Congress was useful, not only for the reforms, legal and administrative, which it promoted, but also for preventing, by the publicity of its proceedings, the abuses to which non-representative government is liable."

All this is excellent; and, as readers of INDIA are aware, it is but one out of many instances of impartial and favourable testimony.

Indians in
South Africa.

A grim commentary upon Mr. Chamberlain's menaces to President Kruger with reference to the grievances of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal is afforded by the persecution of British Indian subjects in British colonies in South Africa. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been for two years, and still is, in communication with Mr. Chamberlain on this subject, but so far, it would appear, with very little practical result. In spite of protests and appeals from South Africa and India, Mr. Chamberlain has declined to disallow the new Franchise Law Amendment Act in Natal, which will have the effect of excluding British Indian subjects from civic rights. Other measures of a similar character are still, it would seem, under Mr. Chamberlain's consideration, and his decision in regard to the treatment of British Indian subjects in British colonies must inevitably supply a standard by which his attitude towards the Transvaal will be judged. Mr. M. K. Gandhi, who recently visited India, laid before his fellow-countrymen the disabilities and indignities under which Indians suffer, and the whole case was presented to Lord George Hamilton last December in an incisive memorial drawn up by Mr. Pheroze Shah Mehta.

THE condition of affairs which the Indignities and Disabilities. memorial and subsequent telegrams from South Africa reveal is deplorable. Throughout South Africa British Indian subjects of the Crown are not only subjected to the most humiliating indignities by European colonists, but are harassed by legal disabilities of the most vexatious and injurious kind. Indians, for example, cannot travel on the railways or tramways without frequent molestation. In some parts of South

Africa they are prohibited by law from travelling in any class but the third class. They are pushed off footpaths, and excluded from the public baths and Government schools. "Altogether," as Mr. Mehta says, "the Indian is a hated being throughout South Africa; he is shunned as a pariah. Every Indian is a coolie without distinction." Mr. Mehta suggests that the evidence which is forthcoming establishes a good *prima facie* case for a State enquiry. He admits, of course, that the "intervention of Her Majesty's Government with respect to such grievances can only be indirect and slow." But he believes that "an expression of an emphatic opinion may do much to allay the unreasonably strong feeling that seems undoubtedly to exist in South Africa towards the Indians." The real object of the disfranchising legislation in Natal is believed to be not so much protection against a future preponderance of the Indian over the European vote, as the degradation of Indians, "so that it may not be worth the while of a respectable Indian trader to seek his livelihood in Natal." Indians in Natal have no objection to a reasonable educational test, or a high property qualification, for the franchise. What they resent is disfranchisement on grounds of race, in spite of the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, which guaranteed to Indians equal rights with other British subjects.

A MEDICAL CORRESPONDENT writes:—

The Plague. "At a time when the attention of the public is taken up on the one hand with laudable attempts to mitigate the ravages of famine in India, and on the other with unedifying newspaper correspondence and discussion on the alleged effects of the withdrawal of the Acts which aimed at the diminution of diseases of a certain type in the army in India, another, and in many respects an equally serious calamity, the plague, is in danger of receiving less attention than its terrible importance demands. The famine is confined (if the word is allowable in connexion with such an extended and cruel force) to India. It cannot take ship from Bombay and travel speedily to Marseilles or to Liverpool. The plague, on the contrary, may quite easily seek for itself fresh ground, and is not likely to find much difficulty in meeting with a suitable soil among a famine-stricken people. The awful effects of the plague during its past visits to Europe should warrant a Government in taking very strong measures for its limitation. Those who have fortunately not been brought into contact with the horrors of this disease in India and desire to know something of it will find in Defoe's 'History of the Plague' a sufficiently gruesome account of the 'sickness' itself, the sufferings it entailed, and some of the means taken to escape infection. Defoe was

born about the time the plague was raging in London, so that he can have had no personal knowledge of it. But he lived at a period sufficiently close to it to have had opportunities of hearing the personal experiences of those who had themselves suffered, or had observed the appearances of the disease in those whom they tended. Interesting also it is to note that, even when the plague had lost its epidemicity, there were numerous scattered cases in the lower parts of London, each of which might have been the means of giving the scourge a new life, if proper soil had been met with. The deliverance from this menace came in the form of another calamity, the Great Fire of London. The lesson derived from all the visitations of the Black Death is that it is essentially a disease which flourishes among badly-fed and consequently ill-nourished people, and that the existence of bad sanitary conditions are simply a welcome extended to the visitation. Two years ago a distinguished army medical officer, in a lecture to the Public Health Society of Calcutta, besought them to take steps to prevent the plague from obtaining entrance there. He stated that if once the plague found its way into Calcutta the situation and sanitary condition of that city would make the disease show itself in a more formidable manner than it had done in Hong Kong. In the recurrence of the disease at Hong Kong in 1895 it was found that Europeans were more liable to be attacked than had been the case during the epidemic of the previous year, but that the chances of recovery were much greater among Europeans than among the native Chinese. No medicinal treatment seemed to be of much service, and reliance was placed upon alcoholic and other stimulants. A French bacteriologist, Dr. Yersin, has produced a serum, which he claims has curative powers, but its reputation has yet to be made. The same *savant* is continuing investigations—begun at Amoy and Canton—in Bombay. Nusservanji Fakirji Surveyor has also worked at the bacteriology of the disease, and has noted the existence in the blood of subjects affected with the plague minute bodies, which may possibly prove to be the spores of the plague bacillus. This gentleman, who is honorary physician to the Bombay J. J. Hospital, took some years ago the public health diploma at the University of Cambridge. Englishmen everywhere will wish him success in his efforts on behalf of his countrymen."

It is a good sign for the moral progress of India when men of light and leading among her own sons come forward and appeal publicly to their fellow-countrymen in such a matter as Hindu female education, urging them to put their shoulders to the

The Education of Hindu Girls.

wheel and personally promote the good cause. This remark is called forth by a memorandum on Hindu female education by Dewán Bahádúr Manibhai Jasbhai, printed at Bombay last year, which has just come under our notice. The Dewan is well known in the Bombay Presidency, especially in Gujarát, his native province, where he has held the important post of Minister to the Gaikwár of Baroda, after holding a similar position in Kutch. As he is well to the front among Native Administrators, his opinions on the important subject with which he deals are worthy of all attention. He divides his remarks into ten chapters, as follows: i, The present situation; ii, The need for female education; iii, Woman as wife and mother; iv, The consequences of neglect of female education; v, Methods of instruction; vi, Vernacular literature for women and infant schools; vii, Ways and means; viii, The course of instruction; ix, Conclusion. In describing the present situation the Dewan gives us some very interesting statistics. There are in Bombay 11,864 institutions for the education of males, numbering 597,840 scholars, while for females there are but 901 institutions with 84,101 scholars, the percentage of male scholars to male population of school-going age being 28.79, and that of females being only 4.32. To take primary schools, the most important in a general view of the care of a people to provide for the education of their children, there were, in 1895, 8,636 institutions for males and 731 for females, the former having 184,107 scholars and the latter only 68,870, although in actual numbers the male population in the Bombay Presidency, including Native States, only exceeded the female by 849,613, the males being 12,841,959 and the females 12,992,346. Out of the 68,870 female scholars even, only 25,095 were sufficiently advanced to be able to read printed books. To give greater emphasis to this comparison, the Dewan points out that girls are mostly withdrawn from school just at a time when they have barely passed what may be termed the parrot-like stage, when lessons are learnt by little children by rote, without the requisite maturity of thought or understanding. The proper period for the commencement of effectual instruction is only then reached, and thus, practically speaking, Indian women hardly get any real benefit from education. He admits that some progress is being made, but it is miserably slow, for, as has been remarked by Mr. Baines, the late Census Commissioner, where there were ten years ago four women in every thousand who were not illiterate there are now five.

A Comprehensive Programme
The arguments by which the Dewan supports his plea for further efforts in the cause of female education are well known, and need not be recapitulated here.

We proceed at once to the measures he proposes in order to improve matters. These are epitomised at the end of the pamphlet, and the chief of them may be indicated as follows:—

- (i) The education of native opinion in favour of female education, especially by the delivery of lectures by male and female agency.
 - (ii) The supply of a greater number of female teachers—a want very much felt, especially for the continuation of the education of girls when they reach the marriageable age, and are almost universally withdrawn from school, by an increase of scholarships available at the Kathiawar and Ahmedabad Training Colleges, and the opening of a Preparatory Class at Surat. (These provisions (i) and (ii) apply to the Province of Gujarát and Kathiawar.)
 - (iii) To provide partly for the Decan and Konkan, the establishment of a Training College at Bombay, with Mahráti and Gujaráti sides, with such other measures for the former as might be recommended by well-wishers there based on local requirements.
 - (iv) The appointment of an Inspectress in addition to the Director-General of education.
 - (v) The establishment of a *Stri Gnan Shála*, or school for the instruction of grown-up women, with home teaching as an optional alternative. This institution to have attached to it a Sanskrit Pandita to impart religious and moral instruction. (N.B.—The former of these objects would be objected to as part of the system of State education.)
 - (vi) The promotion of vernacular literature for women: this is accompanied by a recommendation for the preparation of a graduated religious series in the vernacular with quotations of Sanskrit texts, to serve as manuals to be taught by experts, which also would be inadmissible in State education.
 - (vii) Publication of vernacular magazines especially for women.
 - (viii) Establishment of infant schools and introduction of the Kindergarten system.
 - (ix) The organisation of a *Stree Vardhak Sabha*, or society for the promotion of female education, with branches in the Mofussil and a special fund.
- And, lastly,
- (x) The adoption of an approved graduated course of instruction and the preparation of the requisite text books.

The programme is thorough-going and sufficiently comprehensive, but, as we may remind the Dewan, also expensive, and we much fear unattainable in the present state of India's finances, unless his arguments induce a large number of Indians of wealth and influence to subscribe handsomely for the purpose. Could he not assemble a conclave of retired native officers to consult on the subject, and place before their fellow-countrymen and the Government some tangible scheme for the fulfilment of his praiseworthy proposals. Perhaps he will think—as we do—that the Government of India might well devote to education much of the money now squandered upon militarism.

THE CANTONMENTS QUESTION. AGAIN.

BY PROFESSOR STUART, M.P.

The Report of the Departmental Committee on Venereal Disease in the British Army in India, which has just been issued, is creating quite a furore of excitement. While there is no need to minimise the importance of the facts brought forward in it, it is just worth while stating that the statistics which it gives convey absolutely no additional information beyond that which has been year by year placed before the public in the regular official documents.

The whole point, however, for consideration lies not in the figures, which have practically not been in question, but in what inference we are to found on them and what steps we are to take to meet the evil.

As was anticipated, the attempt is at once being made by the advocates of the C. D. Acts to secure the reimposition of these odious measures. They say, "Look at this grievous amount of disease; the C. D. Acts have been repealed in India, therefore we must restore them." The fallacy of this position lies entirely in this, that the C. D. Acts are no remedy. They have been tried and failed.

Here are the facts shown fairly enough by the Report itself. The admissions into hospital for these diseases were increasing in India while the system was in operation quite as rapidly as since it has been repealed. Anyone can see this who turns to the last columns of page 19. From that it will be seen, taking the last clear ten years while the system was in full vigour, viz., from 1876 to 1886, that the numbers in question increased from 203 per thousand to 385 per thousand. From that date till last year, they rose from 385 to 522: figures which fully bear out what I have said. (Repeal nominally took place in 1888).

There is another most important fact which is also brought out on the same page and in the column preceding that to which I have referred, viz., that the admissions in the home army in England have very greatly decreased since repeal. The number of admissions per 1,000 in the home army in 1882 (the last year when the Acts were in full vigour in England) was 246. But since that date it has greatly diminished, and the figures for the last four recorded years (1892-95) are 201, 194, 182, 178.

How, then, is it in any way logical to attribute to repeal the rise since that event in India, when, first, the rise there was taking place before repeal, and when, secondly, repeal in England has been accompanied by so great and continuous a fall?

By the way, I may just here correct an error which is made by a large part of the defenders of the C. D. A.

system. It is frequently said that half the army in India is in hospital. This, of course, is not the case. The figure 522 above quoted, refers to the number of admissions into hospital, and includes quite trivial affections. The army returns show that the number of men constantly in hospital from these diseases comes to about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole in India, which is about a twelfth part of the other figure. It is well to view these figures, bad enough as they are, from the proper standpoint, and to be accurate as to what we are dealing with.

Those who are unalterably opposed to the immoral and discredited C.D.A. system are yet by no means in favour of a do-nothing policy. From the first we have known and said that the abolition of the system of Regulation was but a clearing of the ground, and our hope was that when the ground should be so cleared the army authorities might be led to seek and to find a better way. Such a better way has not, I am afraid, really been seriously entered on. The things that can be done all come under one great head. An honest attempt must be made to diminish the vice which is the cause of the disease. To do anything else while neglecting this is in vain. We demand, therefore, that there should be no reversion to an immoral and discredited system, but that practical steps should be taken which, while supplying adequate means for treatment of disease, should be based on a positive discouragement of sexual vice and a positive recognition of the merits of abstinence. There are many and most important suggestions which have been made and which can be made in this direction, and these ought to be at once considered, and such of them as recommend themselves should be adopted. Those who clamour for the reintroduction of the C.D. Acts are standing in the way of rational and effectual remedies.

INDIA'S ECONOMIC DRAIN.

BY W. M. J. WILLIAMS.

In a recent number, in giving a summary of Mr. O'Connor's Review of the Trade of India in 1895-6, a brief reference was made to the constant large excess of the exports over the imports. This was characterised as a "drain" upon India, but the subject was not pursued. The Editor, however, in a note made some remarks upon the subject, drawing attention to the just characterisation as a "drain," but demurring to the view taken by some that this said excess is justly to be regarded as a part of Indian trade. As the article and the note have received some notice, it may be useful once again to ventilate this question of the drain. As to the fact, that there is a drain, there can be little

question: what significance should be attached to it is, indeed, one of the Indian questions respecting which a sound conclusion is much to be desired. In this paper I propose to regard this "drain" as anything but a channel of health. While doing this, if the Editor permits, I will not deny that the statistics of India's trade rightly include transactions required to meet the claims roughly represented by the excess of exports by the economic drain. There can be little question that these necessary transactions take place much in the ordinary way of commerce, and, indeed, cannot be distinguished from ordinary commerce except by the ultimate results. In the course of these transactions those who engage in them have made profits or losses, as the case may be; the "drain" is found to have been dug when a balance of all the trade done comes to be drawn. But our purpose is to consider the drain, to ascertain it as a fact, and to consider its relation to the welfare of India. Happily the tables upon which the report of the trade by Mr. O'Connor was founded are now to hand, and, together with other documents, they enable us to make a few comparisons bearing upon this crucial question.

The following table summarises the trade of India for 5 years ending 1895-6.

	1891-2.	1892-3.	1893-4.	1894-5.	1895-6.
Exports—	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Merchandise ...	104,173,592	106,595,475	106,503,308	108,911,778	114,334,738
Treasure ...	3,286,646	6,968,924	4,100,192	8,226,072	4,259,811
Total Exports	111,460,278	113,564,399	110,603,500	117,137,850	118,594,549
Imports—					
Merchandise ...	69,432,988	66,265,277	77,021,492	73,528,003	72,936,753
Treasure ...	14,722,662	17,000,810	18,461,250	9,581,207	13,307,986
Total Imports	84,155,650	83,275,087	95,482,742	83,110,210	86,244,739
Excess of Exports	27,305,238	30,279,312	15,120,758	34,029,650	32,349,810

These figures include Government stores among the imports and exports of merchandise. Mr. O'Connor supplies us with a set of figures distinguishing these Government transactions as they affect the excess of exports.

India—Excess of Exports.

	Including Government Transactions.	Excluding Government Transactions.		Including Government Transactions.	Excluding Government Transactions.
1886-7	17,359,900	20,308,400	1891-2	27,305,200	29,869,100
1887-8	13,317,800	16,774,700	1892-3	30,279,300	33,850,100
1888-9	15,548,400	18,366,400	1893-4	15,120,900	18,090,100
1889-90	18,700,700	21,219,400	1894-5	34,029,600	37,216,200
1890-1	8,440,700	11,253,200	1895-6	32,280,800	35,820,100
—	Rx.	Rx.	—	Rx.	Rx.

It is very convenient to have the figures analysed so, but it seems that with regard to the subject in hand we must take the excess on the grand total, including Government transactions, as our guide and basis. The above table will then become very

interesting when studied along with the following table:—

Drawings of the Secretary of State in Council Bills.

	Pounds £	Ex-change.	Rx.		Pounds £	Ex-change.	Rx.
1886-7	12,136,279	17-441	16,700,300	1891-2	16,083,854	16-733	26,082,800
1887-8	15,358,577	16-809	21,812,400	1892-3	16,532,215	14-984	26,478,400
1888-9	14,262,359	16-379	20,806,100	1893-4	9,580,234	14-516	15,728,600
1889-90	15,474,496	16-506	22,419,700	1894-5	16,905,102	13-1	30,869,900
1890-1	15,969,083	16-089	21,186,900	1895-6	17,664,493	13-638	31,085,500
—		Pence.	Rx.	—		Pence.	Rx.

This table makes me qualify the remark following the previous table respecting the basis of the enquiry. The excess of exports including Government stores may be taken as a basis, but it would be misleading, were we to omit the Rx. 3,530,300 for 1895-6 say, from the economic drain, because it is excluded as a Government transaction in stores. As a balance of trade in the produce and merchandise of India the exclusion is legitimate and the balance of exports over imports for 1895-6 is no less than Rx. 35,820,100, a truly colossal sum. What discussions on policy would arise in Great Britain were the British returns to show such a phenomenon? As things are, we have some wiseacres among us who with crying and tears lament that our imports show an excess over exports, but on the whole these cries are as unheeded as the screeches of pelicans in the wilderness. John Bull, with all his pother, never mistakes regarding the advantage of larger incomings than outgoings. But India, so strangely and so long deemed strewn with pearls and rubies and choked with wealth of various kinds, is seen to be subject to an opposite state of things. And this loss on the balance is a steadily progressive one. The excess of exports for 1895-6 represents about 2s. 9d. per head of the population, or equal to a fortnight's income of India's poor. At a time when famine is devastating the greater portion of India, and looking to the fact that this excess of exports is a chronic feature of Indian affairs, to pay attention to so serious a leakage is a duty of the most pressing kind.

One of the remarkable features of the above tables is the Government import of treasure, of gold and silver. Further details show that in 1895-6, of gold there was an excess of import over export of Rx. 2,526,000, and of silver of Rx. 6,582,000, or a total excess import of gold and silver of Rx. 9,108,000. This reminds us that the excess of exports of merchandise is far greater than appears from the total figures, and it is found to be no less than Rx. 41,398,000. But of the exchange which India makes with Great Britain a very large sum is seen to be in gold and silver. Seven-eighths of the silver imported into India in 1895-6 was in bars, the remainder being taken in rupees, dollars, and other coins. This points to the fact that most of it was taken for trade purposes by the dealers. Mr. O'Connor, indeed, is at much trouble to show how the closure of the mint in June 1893 has influenced the form in which the silver is taken. His elaborate diagram and

notes thereon lead to the conclusion that previous to that Act the price of silver ruled that of the rupee, whereas he shows that since the change the contrary case has been established, with the consequence that dealers think it more profitable to import the metal than the rupee. Of the quantity imported about 15 per cent., it is computed, is used for coins in Native States and the remainder for the following purposes: (1) manufacture of ornaments; (2) sent across the frontiers to neighbouring countries; (3) hoarded in substitution of disinterred rupees (though not to a large extent); and (4) left in stock with dealers. In dealing with this adverse balance of trade it was necessary to follow the movement of treasure, and we have gained a negative advantage, which is, the emergence of the fact that a large part of the treasure imported is an ordinary exchange, a portion of ordinary trade. This sends us to another quarter for the light required upon the excess of exports.

Recurring then to the last table given above I find some pertinent matter. Rx. 31,085,000 were drawn by the Secretary of State in Bills during 1895-6, and for the same period the gross excess of exports was Rx. 35,820,100 (or 32,289,800 including the Government Stores Account.) Mr. O'Connor makes this pertinent note. "In these ten years [see drawings table above] the exchange value of the rupee has fallen 21·8 per cent.; the excess of exports over imports was Rx. 212,401,300, and the cost of the Council Bills drawn was Rx. 230,357,600." So that, on the ten year period, the drawings were even larger than the excess of export, and the fall on the rupee has been a powerful factor in the situation. Eureka! All this is known, well-known, but this is a day when it should be shouted in the street, and the cry kept up until the busy Briton shall have found that it has penetrated into his mind and into his heart. Loss will continue, India will suffer, her people will starve, and Britain's power there will be less stable than it should be so long as the British people do not know what is being done in their name. The bureaucrats know and have long known the bleeding sore.

We need not attempt to give a Balance of the account as between the excess of exports and the Council Bills for the year 1895-6. The summary already given for the last decade has made that unnecessary. The Home Accounts for 1894-5 show a disbursement in London of £25,469,041 and the Estimates of Home Charges for 1895-6 were £20,143,192. At the rate of exchange of 13·1 and 13·638 pence respectively, these sums would be equal to about Rx. 46,660,838 for 1894-5, and 35,447,764 for 1895-6. There were considerable sums which were in the nature of receipts on these accounts, but the figures serve to show the large transactions, the heavy payments which have to be made at home on behalf of India. It is necessary, too, to remember that some of these payments are, in some years especially, in the nature of capital expenditure.

But when all is said and done, these Home Charges are the drain upon India, or in other words India's surplus is swept into Britain annually. Let us tick off, not all, but the principal items among these Home Charges for the year ending March, 1896. Interest on Debt (excluding that on railways) £2,622,695;

Postal Services £106,606; Telegraph Services £101,071; General Administration £243,912; Contribution to Admiralty £236,599; Political Services (Mission to Persia. £7,000; her Majesty's establishments in China £12,500; the Shazada's visit to England £25,408; etc.) £47,693; Political Pensions £9,565; Civil Furlough and Absentee Allowances £223,452; Superannuations and Pensions £1,817,711; Stationery and Printing for the India Office and Stores £45,443; Examination Expenses, etc., £18,286; Railway Revenue Account £5,747,782; Buildings and Roads £117,321; the Army £4,136,692; and Defence Works Stores £45,241. In addition, there were payments in the nature of capital expenditure, or discharge of Debt, as follows:—Railways and Irrigation Works £683,215; Debt Cancelled £2,001,600; Payments to Railway Companies on Capital Account £853,820; and Remittances to England £996,754. This last item, of course, includes only remittances made on behalf of the Government of India, and does not take cognizance of any sums transmitted by private persons. The nature of these Government payments will enable any reader to understand how very expensive a thing is Government to India. This expensiveness may be regarded from two points of view at least, viz., with regard to the poverty of the great mass of the population, and also because of the double Government establishment, viz., in India and in London. We have established the fact that in 1895-6 a deficit of over Rx. 32,000,000 was found in the exchange of Indian produce. This is almost, if not quite, wholly accounted for by remittances to England in various ways. To any sober and sane mind the fact is staggering and when we put it along with the famine now raging, the Mansion House Fund, however creditable in itself, only makes it look the more ominous and threatening. It will be, and it is said that for the most part, with the exception of the Army Charges, the large sums which we have just named are paid for great works which were capitalised from England, and from which India is to—and will increasingly—benefit. Here, of course, how easy it would be to enter on a fray, a perennial battle, in which Anglo-Indians are conspicuous for belabouring each other. Let it be conceded that these works are calculated to benefit India ultimately. Does it not become increasingly clear that India cannot afford them? Many a poor man would find many expensive things exceedingly agreeable, but their cost would crush him and leave him dead by the wayside; on the contrary, some of a less expensive kind, rendered as he could manage to use and pay for them, would be not only bearable, but highly productive in raising his status. All who have paid any attention to the careers of those who have represented England in India have much to admire, but it is equally true that a great many have also gone to India as to a satrapy in which a fortune was to be made, and made from a governmental position. It is probable, nay, it is certain, that the present does not afford so many examples of this as the past, and for a good reason—the wealth of India has long ago been largely swept away. The long and the short of the story seems to be that the British Raj has been to India politically

beneficent, and economically withering. It has secured for India a share in the *Pax Britannica* but at the cost of supporting in London and India a gubernatorial caste which by its pride, cupidity and military lust, has taken for itself the produce which should have been sustaining the teeming millions of India's plains and hills. Need it be said that this sad tendency of the English rule in India has not been deliberately sought of the high governmental authority. It has not been the fault of Government as such, but it has assuredly been chiefly the fault of bureaucratic officials, including the individuals comprised in the Government at home and in India. And whether there be an early agreement as to such apportionment of culpability, it is to be hoped that the day is near, very near, when the British people will deliberately take in hand the resolution of the problem presented to them when India has an annual tribute of over £32,000,000 to pay to some of them, and that though she is subject at short periods to suffer the horrors and privations of a famine. When that happy moment comes, I believe the verdict will be short and sharp to the effect that an end shall be put to such a condition of affairs. No condition will be tolerable to India and honourable to England, save that in which India's exchange with England shall show a balance, however small, in her own favour. To wait for the verdict of the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure before these things are again placed before the public is impossible; they are so pressing, they are so dangerous, and well will it be should they prove less dangerous than we fear. At some other time I may be able to say something of the way in which the Indian people are taxed to meet the expense of their Governments, and we shall find that to be a subject complementary to that of the excess of exports which I have tried to set before readers of these columns. So long as taxes are heavy and tribute is great there can be no wonder if suffering is dire when rains fail and crops are not.

OUR DUTY IN INDIA.

By DONALD N. REID.

"He'd seen his duty a dead-sure thing,
And he went for it thar and then;
And Christ ain't a-goin' to be too hard
On a man that died for men."—JIM BLUNSON.

"We justly reprobate Ottoman mis-government, and pity the unhappy peasantry of the Turkish provinces. It is a serious reflection that almost equal misery is being inflicted over a far wider area, under the best meaning of Governments, and through the most scientific systems."—W. G. Tedder in "*Famine and Debt in India*," in *Nineteenth Century* for 1877.

A few years ago cholera broke out in its most virulent form among the troops stationed at Lucknow; and when the epidemic had disappeared, two young nurses, who up to then had slaved incessantly in the hospitals, were obliged to visit the hills to recruit their health. They had broken down so completely in doing more than their duty in the cholera hospitals, that they were compelled to remain away from their work in the plains for some considerable time. But, on the first Sunday after

their return to Lucknow, they received quite an ovation from the soldiers who filled the church for morning service, as every man sprang to his feet and remained standing until the little ladies had taken their seats. I wish I had been there to witness that scene; it would have been better for me than any sermon that was ever preached, as Christ was certainly in the hearts of the men who made the spontaneous demonstration of respect and gratitude for duty performed in the face of death.

The so-called Parliament of Religions, which was held at Chicago in 1893, and which drew together the representatives of all the religions of the world, gave the first practical recognition to the teaching of the Apostle who said that "in every nation he who feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him." And now we hear of English nurses being anxious to volunteer for service in the plague-stricken districts of India, to work among the natives, if the public will provide the necessary funds for their outfit and passage. Here indeed is a noble example shown by our countrywomen, who solemnly acknowledge the duty owing to their fellow-subjects in the East. But let it be said with shame and sorrow that the bureaucrats of the India Office are still afraid to face an enquiry on the spot into the condition of the masses. Every well-wisher of India wants the true state of matters to be brought vividly home to the imagination of the British public, and the India Office shirks its duty by refusing to lift the veil; while on the other hand our delicately nurtured English sisters are prepared to throw themselves into the jaws of death at the prompting of the higher instincts of humanity.

England's duty to India is to make it impossible for famine to take hold of the people in that country, and in fulfilling this duty England should condone everything but failure to save life in man and beast. At present the tradition of the India Office is that it is Utopian to expect to save the people when crops fail them. As the old lady said, "sailors are used to drowning," so the India Office declares that the rayats are accustomed to die of starvation. The bureaucratic idea is that famine is one of Nature's methods for getting rid of the surplus population of the soil; and, although it is the duty of the Government to render some assistance by means of relief works, still the real danger lies in giving too much. Well, the result of this system was seen in Southern India in 1877-78, when nearly 6,000,000 people perished from starvation; and even during minor famines most ghastly scenes are enacted, as will be shown by the following extract from a letter of Mr. Archibald Forbes, the *Daily News* commissioner to the famine districts in 1873-74:

"The north-western section of the subdivision of Sitamarhi is that part of Tirhoot in which the ravages of the famine of 1866 were the most terrible. The wider-spread calamity in Orissa threw into the shade the Tirhoot famine of that terrible year. Mr. Robert Wilson was living then at Parhiar factory, in the very heart of the famine-stricken area. The people died like flies all over the place. In a little plot of land close to the feeding-place of the factory, Mr. Wilson used to find from ten to twenty corpses every morning. Stronger women drowned the weaker for the sake of the pittance of food the latter were carrying away from the factory cooking-place, and it became necessary to insist that those who were fed there should eat their allowance on the spot. Unquestionable cases

of cannibalism were forced upon Mr. Wilson's observation. Whole villages were depopulated, and the district to this day is but sparsely inhabited, owing to the mortality in the famine year of 1866. The air was heavy with the effluvia of decomposition, and there are fields which are now fertile because of the number of bodies buried in them. Great as was the mortality among the labouring classes, *they were not the heaviest sufferers.* The factory distributions of cooked food kept life in many, and caste prejudices were thrown off that life might be saved."

My object in giving the above long extract is to show how suddenly famine can take hold of the people in the rice-growing tracts of country that are not protected by irrigation works and by the storage of grain. The sub-division of Sitamarhi is intersected by two large rivers (the Baghmati and the Lakhandai), and by numerous minor streams, the waters of which are utilised for irrigation in a perfunctory manner in seasons of drought. But there is no organised system of irrigation practised, and the result is that the people continually suffer from either serious distress or famine on the failure of their rice crops. On the other hand the Tharus (a race of Indo-Chinese origin), who cultivate the sub-montane lands in the north of Ramnagar Pargana in the Champaran district, are a marked exception to the poverty-stricken rayats of North Behar. These men are most expert irrigators, and have constructed channels many miles in length to convey the water of the hill streams to their fields. Moreover, they take the precaution to store their rice against seasons of scarcity; the result of this far-seeing measure being that not a single Tharu (man, woman, or child) came on to the relief works during the famine of 1874, when one-third of the population of North Behar was being almost entirely supported by Government. The Tharus by their general prudence and foresight have raised themselves far above all other cultivators in the province, and when the famine was at its height in 1874, they declared that they had still sufficient rice in store for six months' consumption. Surely what the Tharus can do the other rayats could imitate if they were freed from the yoke of the middleman and relieved of the burden of debt. This is work indeed to give the Anglo-Indians some healthy interest in life, instead of taking in deadly earnest the cynical aphorism that "If you want to make money, be sure not to make anything else."

In reading the detailed account of the debate on the address which followed the amendment moved by Sir William Wedderburn, I was struck by a remark made by Sir James Fergusson, which I think requires to be contradicted. He said that Sir William Wedderburn had not made "a very extensive foundation for the very wide and far-reaching enquiry which he now proposed. When the hon. baronet was in India his views on the question of administration were not in harmony with those of the great majority of the members of the service to which he belonged." Now, I have already given an extract from a most interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century* for September 1877, from the pen of the late Mr. W. G. Pedder, who was Secretary to the Government of Bombay, and afterwards served his term of service as a Secretary in the India Office. This is what

that highly-placed official said regarding the indebtedness of the rayat:—

"It must be remembered that the question of debt is an almost equally pressing one in almost every province in India, and equally affects not the yeoman alone, but every class of landowner, from the Rajput or Muhammadan noble to the aboriginal tribes of the hill and forest."

Again he said:—

"A few years ago, an old peasant in the Gaskwar's country, then infamously misgoverned, was complaining to a British officer of the oppression his village suffered from, but on being asked why he did not come into British territory, where land would be given him, he replied, 'God forbid! At least we have no civil courts.' There is, however, a depth lower than penury or exile. Sometimes the wretched debtor executes an agreement which almost avowedly makes him the bond slave of his creditor. In one case cited by the Commission, a cultivator and his wife, after their land and property had been sold, passed a bond to labour for the creditor for thirteen years, '*dash wa par-dash*,' at home or abroad, for food and tobacco, and one blanket a year."

The above may, however, be looked upon as ancient history by the apologists of the Government. In that case I refer them to the article in the *National Review* for February, 1894, by Mr. H. E. M. James, another highly-placed Bombay civilian, who was a member of the Governor-General's Legislative Council in the year 1895. Mr. James is no narrow-minded faddist; as anybody can see by a perusal of his book, "*The Long White Mountain*," that he has been a most observant traveller in his day; and I recommend the reader to study and digest all that he says in the *National Review* about the iniquity worked to the rayats through the agency of our civil courts. Then there is still another highly-placed Bombay civilian, Mr. H. P. Malet, who some years ago published in the *Salisbury and Winchester Journal* a very distressing account of the ruin brought upon the districts of the Deccan, by the substitution of English rule for that of the Peshwa, in 1818. This is what Mr. Malet said regarding the storage of grain:

"In former years when roads were bad, it was usual to find great stores of grain in the smallest villages. I have known it kept for four years. The transit duty was abolished in 1836, roads have been improved and railroads made, a ready market is obtained, and no grain comparatively is now stored."

This is what he said about our civil courts:

"The civil courts are now solely used against the cultivators; forgery, perjury, and false accounts are brought into play against those who have no wit of their own, and no money to buy other wit to help them."

Mr. H. P. Malet is one of the oldest retired officers of the Indian Civil Service. He was formerly a member of the Bombay Council, and his personal knowledge of that presidency is very extensive, as it stretches over the last half-century.

Regarding the storage of grain, anyone conversant with agricultural practices will see the insane folly of the system of exportation which is now in vogue. In my article in the February number of this journal I pointed out that the inferior food-grains of India were enveloped in a very thick husk. Now, the lives of the cattle are to be considered in a famine as well as the lives of men, and if these grains were stored for local consumption in seasons of drought, the husk would be utilised as food for live stock. But in a famine year under present conditions we

The Government, it must be admitted, has failed to discharge its duty in one respect. It has taken

no steps to provide for, or to encourage, technical education. It is true that until the last decade there was not much demand for schools where a training in mechanical arts could be given. But, on the other hand, Government did nothing to stimulate educated youths to utilise their talents in acquiring a knowledge of the arts by offering prizes or scholarships or by holding out the hope of employment to successful students. In Bombay there is a school of art. But the instruction imparted there is elementary. In Patna we have the School of Engineering. It was recently visited by the Lieut.-Governor of Bengal, who kindly promised it his support, and hoped it might soon become a technical institute or college for the whole of Behar. In Lahore there is the School of Art, which has made its mark. But what can these few institutions do for a country like India, with its millions of inhabitants? It is the duty of the Government to provide for the wants of the people in this respect. Every encouragement and facility should be offered to those who seek technical training. If it cannot be obtained in India, a selected number of young men ought to be sent to Europe to acquire a knowledge of the technical arts. The Baroda State has recently sent four students at its own expense to Europe. One is in London learning cabinet-making. Another is in Geneva trying to master the intricacies of watch-making. A third is also at Geneva acquiring a knowledge of pottery; whilst the fourth has gone to Boston to study engineering. What a contrast the action of the Baroda State presents to the lethargy and indifference of the British Government!

But, whatever be the shortcomings of the Government in this respect, we cannot absolve ourselves from the charge of indifference. Scores of young men who eat their dinners at one of the Luns of Court would have done much better, so far as their own prospects are concerned, if they had apprenticed themselves to a firm of engineers or manufacturers and, on their return to India, had filled lucrative appointments now necessarily given to Europeans who have received the requisite practical training. Here in India the rage for quill-driving is really impoverishing a good many families of the middle classes, whose members are earning a pittance as clerks, whereas, if they pursued their hereditary callings, they would have much better wages. As regards the three higher castes they would have done well if they had reflected that "it is the man who determines the dignity of the occupation, and not the occupation which measures the dignity of the man." These classes have to face a specially gloomy outlook. They have not only to contend against the competition of their own castes but also against the surging mass from the lower castes, eager to oust them from the professions. Twenty years ago the kayasths almost monopolised the offices which required some literary ability. But now they are being replaced to a great extent by the bunya, or money-lending, class. This is the only caste which has prospered under British rule. Whilst the others are being gradually impoverished, these have reaped a golden harvest from the misfortunes of their fellow-men. It is a credit to them that they are giving their sons a good education.

But necessity knows no law. Here in India we find a repetition of the old process of man's adapting himself to circumstances. The touch of a Sudra is pollution to a Brahman. Yet we find a Brahman complacently rubbing shoulders with a *chamar* or a pariah in a railway carriage. At each new station where it was proposed to construct waterworks there was an outcry on behalf of the higher castes. But a few years after the proposal had become an accomplished fact, the Brahman and the Sudra, the Kshetriya and the pariah, were to be seen calmly taking their turn to draw water from the same standard. And so in course of time will the struggle for existence remove the abhorrence of certain castes for manual labour. Already the process has begun. The hereditary calling of a Brahman is that of a priest. But in these degenerate days this occupation is by no means so remunerative as it was.

The other day I came across a man in court who being asked his caste said that he was a Brahman, and being asked his occupation said that he was a cultivator. Hard times had compelled him to handle a plough, which would have filled his ancestors with horror. Not long ago, crossing a river I found the *Mullahs* wearing the sacred thread. I asked them what their caste was and found, much to my astonishment, that they were Brahmans, who, as they told me, had to eke out their limited income by taking a contract for the ferry. And among the educated classes it is gratifying to find that a Brahman, Pandit Krishna Mohan Dhur, has undertaken the work of tanning leather. Having himself learnt the process he now owns a manufactory which he personally directs. For the kayasths it is no unusual thing now to engage in wholesale and in retail trade, though I am not aware that any have yet become artisans. The great obstacle in their way would be the difficulty of learning a trade. They would be as reluctant to resort for instruction to a carpenter or a smith as these would be to impart knowledge to persons not belonging to their caste. It is here that technical schools, started by the Government, would have a most useful sphere. A hopeful sign is that Kayastha Sabhas in Upper India are bestirring themselves to obtain the consent of the community for members of the caste to engage in occupations which are forbidden to them by established usage.

This is very encouraging so far as it goes, but a great deal more needs to be done, not so much perhaps individually as by co-operation. It is to the educated classes that we look for this. India at one time supplied the whole world with her manufactured articles. But now India is dependant on imports for the necessities of life. The majority of Indians would have to go naked, so far at least as finer goods are concerned, if Manchester were to stop its trade with this country. Yet at one time the calicoes and the muslins of India were famous all over the world. The artisan has not yet lost his cunning if only he were to receive encouragement. The manufacture of muslins in Dacca is decaying. But there are weavers who are still able to supply as fine a cloth as could be desired. The silversmiths of Cuttack and Delhi can turn out jewellery which, for fineness and delicacy of workmanship, is simply

unequaled. The brasiers of Benares, Moradabad and Guzarat are now largely exporting their manufactures, which are most artistic alike in design and execution. The report of the Material Progress of the Punjab for the decade 1881-1891, issued by the Local Government, says:

"The smiths of Kolli Loharan (Sialkote) are capable of forging small objects with intricate joints with truth and neatness that could not be surpassed in Europe."

And again:

"Among a multiplicity of small wares in iron, locks, which are of prime necessity in native life, may be mentioned. A representative of Messrs Chubb's firm lately visiting the Punjab was greatly struck by the ingenuity and skill shown in the best work, and by its extraordinary cheapness."

If only the Native princes, the zemindars, the rich merchants and the educated classes generally, were to make up their minds to encourage and support the decaying manufactures of the country, it is not unreasonable to hope that a fresh stimulus would be given to the trade and industry of India and an immeasurable blessing conferred on those classes who, under British rule, are being gradually impoverished.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress continue to receive from their correspondents in India replies to the enquiries recently circulated with reference to the famine.

The recent reports from Dhulia and Bellary confirm the intelligence which we published last month to the effect that the measures adopted by Government are regarded in the affected districts as inadequate, and that the rate of wages paid to labourers employed on relief works is too low.

RAINFALL.

As regards rainfall, the information received by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress may be summarised as follows:—

	Normal yearly rainfall.	Actual rainfall in 1896.
	inches.	inches.
Ahmednagar (Bombay) ..	21	19.58
Bhagalpur (Bengal) ..	46.10	40
Muzaffarpur (Bengal) ..	about 50	46.85
Murshidabad (Bengal) ..	60	39.15
Oudh	35.73	23.22

The Congress correspondent at Ahmednagar adds that "the late rains, upon which the district chiefly depends, almost failed." The correspondent at Muzaffarpur says: "In 1896 the rainfall was not far below the average, but the rains did not set in at the proper time, so that there has been failure in the rice-crop."

PRICES OF GRAIN.

The following table summarises the information

received by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress with reference to prices of grain:—

	Staple Grain.	Usual price.	Present price.
Ahmednagar	Jwari or Bajari	55 lbs. per rupee	18-20 lbs. per rupee
Bhagalpur	Rice	19 seers per rupee	10 seers per rupee
Muzaffarpur	Rice, Makai, or Wheat	15-20 seers per rupee	8-10 seers per rupee
Murshidabad	Rice	Rs. 2.8 per maund (80 lbs.)	Rs. 4 per maund
Oudh	Jwari, Barley, etc.	17-38 seers per rupee	8 seers per rupee

The Muzaffarpur correspondent writes that "in the middle of January rice was selling at 8½ seers per rupee, but a private trader imported some Burma rice, which he sells at 9 seers; therefore the price has fallen."

The Murshidabad correspondent writes, under date February 17th: "Owing to the importation of a large quantity of rice from Burma to Calcutta, there has been a slight temporary fall in the price of rice in the Mofussil districts of Bengal."

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION AND LORD GEORGE HAMILTON.

The following is the text of the reply of the Social Democratic Federation to Lord George Hamilton's letter on the Indian Famine:—

TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, M.P.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

My Lord,—I am directed by the Executive Council of the Social Democratic Federation to say, in reply to your letter of the 18th, that the resolution unanimously passed at the great meeting in St. James's Hall, on February 10th, means precisely that which its words convey, namely, that we should at once stop the direct tribute which the India Office now draws from India. Your letter states that the Government intends, if it is at all possible, to extort produce to the value of no less a sum than £17,000,000 from our impoverished dependency, even in this terrible year of famine and plague. My Council certainly suggests, and the resolution on which you comment demands, that, rather than that such a crime should be committed in the name of the people of England, the pensions of the European functionaries who have misadministered and now bleed India should be at once cut off: that the expenditure on the civil department and the military branch of the Government here (the latter, costing not less than £4,700,000 a year, even Sir Henry Brackenbury has just publicly declared to be utterly useless to India) shall be suppressed; and that the interest and dividends on moneys borrowed and expended, without the consent of the people of India, should cease to be paid.

If these necessary retractions involve the proclamation of the bankruptcy of India, this is a far more honest and, in the long run, more politic course than a persistence in the present fatal system. There can be no bankruptcy so ruinous in its effects as that which is forcing millions of the most industrious, thrifty, and temperate people in the world to huddle together on the relief works, a prey to plague and cholera, for the sake of a wretched pittance; dooms many millions more to perish miserably of starvation in their own homes; and yet continues to exact £17,000,000 of direct tribute from the remaining population of starvelings.

The raising of further interest-bearing loans, on the credit of India, as a temporary means of postponing the crash, will only make the ruin more complete when the day of reckoning comes; while your notion that railways contribute to the wealth of India and check famine is directly contrary to the truth. The railways of British India, constructed most expensively with English capital, and managed in all the upper grades by extravagantly-paid Englishmen, so far from enrich-

ing the country or acting as a protection against scarcity, are huge syphons which drain away the substance of the people to England.

If, however, the pensions, interest, dividends, and home charges *must* be paid, as you allege, they should be discharged by the proceeds of a special tax levied on the landlords, capitalists, and middle-class of Great Britain. The workers of this country have never at any time derived the slightest benefit from the Empire in India; nor are they, in any sense whatever, responsible for the present famine, which has been brought about by the policy of the governing classes. It would be monstrous, therefore, that they should be called upon to bear any share of the taxation which you suggest may be imposed here.

The tribute now taken by this country from India is nearly double the £17,000,000 which you state the India Office directly draws from Calcutta. According to the trade figures given in the official Statistical Abstract for 1894-5 (the last year available), the total taken without commercial return from India in that year amounts, properly calculated, to upwards of £30,000,000. This ruinous drain is directly due to the English domination in its present form, and to nothing else. During the eighteen years which have elapsed since the close of the last great famine in 1879, not less than £500,000,000 worth of produce, measured in gold, has, on a moderate computation, been taken by us out of India without return. Moreover, in that same period, the sum of 3,600,000,000 rupees, or, even at the present low rate of exchange, £220,000,000 have been paid out of the revenues of poverty-stricken British India by way of salaries to Europeans. In addition, between 1879 and 1897, 714,000,000 rupees or £44,000,000, have been expended on frontier expeditions: the "sacred trust" of the Famine Insurance Fund having been largely misappropriated to that end. Here, then, is the enormous total of £764,000,000 diverted from useful application by the natives of India in India, to serve the purposes of foreign conquerors within the short space of eighteen years.

Thus has the very life blood of British India been drained out of her, and in this way has the British Government itself manufactured the present famine and plague.

The great Native States, Indore, Gwalior, Hyderabad, Travancore, and Mysore, though governed under light British supervision, and suffering from precisely the same drawbacks of climate as the British territory by which they are surrounded, are able to pay with ease much heavier taxation per head of population than the inhabitants of British territory, and are flourishing and prosperous even at the present time. This, beyond all question, is due to the fact that their wealth is not drained from them continuously, as is the case with the 200,000,000 of inhabitants under our completely Europeanised government.

The catastrophe, which elaborate documents by high officials pigeon-holed in the India Office prove to be inevitable, unless a thorough reorganisation is at once entered upon, will assuredly involve the downfall of our rule. In spite of the hippant fashion in which you yourself have throughout treated the fearful calamity which has fallen upon British India, the Council of the Social Democratic Federation still hopes that the highly successful plan, so happily adopted by Lord Salisbury when he restored Mysore to native rule thirty years ago, will be applied to the rest of Hindostan, and that the solemn pledges contained in the proclamations of 1858, 1879 and 1887 by the Empress of India and Queen of England will, even at this eleventh hour, be fulfilled.

That you should decline to receive a deputation from the great St. James's Hall meeting seems to my Council natural enough on your part. It is easy to deliver a rollicking speech on famine and plague to a set of schoolboys at Harrow; it would be much more difficult for you to defend your policy of fictitious optimism and calculated neglect in the presence of men who know the facts and would not have the slightest hesitation in stating them to your face.

I am, my Lord, your obedient servant.

H. W. LEE, Secretary.

337, Strand, W.C.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON AT CHISWICK.

Speaking on March 10th at the annual dinner of

the Chiswick Constitutional Club, Lord George Hamilton said that

"they had to a certain extent surmounted the greatest difficulties of the task that lay before them in India. Although there must be and would be a deplorable amount of privation, on the whole the operations of the Government had been singularly successful. Though the numbers on the relief list were enormous, the ratio of increase had steadily diminished. If India were only blessed this year with normal rain, he believed they had surmounted the crisis. The response made to the appeal issued some three months back, not only in this country, but throughout her Majesty's dominions, had been most remarkable. (Cheers.) He believed that the total would not be less than one million sterling. (Loud cheers.) On the whole the House of Commons had treated the matter with remarkable consideration, but occasionally questions were put by individual members which showed that they did not in any way realize the magnitude of our rule in India or the enormous masses of people we there governed. Though a casualty might occur here and there, the organization in itself was equal to the strain put upon it. (Cheers.) The contributions from this country would draw closer than before the ties between the Eastern and Western subjects of the Queen-Empress. (Cheers.) He trusted that as they approached the warmer weather the plague would steadily diminish. He had been particularly struck with the courage with which men and women had responded to the appeal made to them to go out. From France and Germany two of the most distinguished *savants* were trying, on the methods initiated by M. Pasteur, to avert the consequences of the plague. He had received a telegram that day pointing to the marvellous success which had resulted from the inoculation practised. Referring to the Cretan question, Lord George Hamilton said that there had been no Prime Minister of recent years who had succeeded in establishing anything like the European reputation and authority which had attached to the name of Lord Salisbury as Foreign Minister of this country. (Loud cheers.) He was not one of those who believed that they must necessarily hold to what was called the Concert if they differed entirely from the principles upon which that Concert rested. But this much might be laid down as a cardinal principle regulating European policy—that the Eastern Question had arisen in an acute shape and tended to the advantage of the Crescent over the Cross because of the disunion and division among the Christian Powers of Europe. Lord Salisbury was, therefore, anxious to maintain so long as he could the Concert of European Powers, for the moment that the Concert was broken up the probable result would be, if war broke out, that the Powers previously united would find themselves in collision with one another."

EXTRACTS FROM THE NEWSPAPERS.

The wealth which our commerce has obtained from our Indian possessions brings with it an enormous responsibility when we reflect that a population of over 300 millions, or one-fifth of the total of the human race, is comprised in that Indian Empire which acknowledges the Queen of England as Empress.—*Sheffield Independent*.

It is a lamentable fact that much money is wasted, that the cost of the bureaucracy in salaries and pensions is enormous, and that petty wars, which absorb vast treasures, are entered into light-heartedly in pursuance of ambitious "forward" programmes. . . . After all has been said for and against, there does undoubtedly remain substantial ground for the opinion that our system of government in India is far from being the best possible, and that, if a policy of progressive improvement tending to increase the interests of the natives in the administration is not followed, there may come a day when even the power of the sword will not be able to repress the discontent of the myriads now subject to British rule.—*Newcastle Leader*.

We now know that originally the Home Government, unfortunately misled by that of India, failed to perceive in time the gravity of the problem. Yet there was warning enough, and many who knew the case of India best strongly represented that a period of exceptional distress was at hand.—*Irish Times*.

The British people, among whom we may, we hope, include

the Irish, have a responsibility to their fellow-subjects in India far more direct and immediate than when the East India Company administered that great Empire. We are now more closely united with them than we ever previously were. Steam and the electric telegraph have brought India almost to our own doors. The people may now be said to have become our own kith and kin.—*Northern Whig*.

All through the crisis the Indian Secretary has shown himself the mere phonograph of Calcutta officialism. . . . It is one of the axioms of Anglo-Indian statesmanship that the occurrence of rainless monsoons are a natural and recurrent phenomenon which must be reckoned with and provided against, by the construction of irrigation works and railways, and if the funds set apart for that purpose had been faithfully dedicated to these works of necessity and mercy many thousands of Hindus who have gone to their graves during the last few months would be alive to-day. But again and again have those funds been wrested to the purpose of military expeditions and territorial aggrandisement, multiplying the nation without increasing the joy. The present famine is not an inscrutable calamity; very largely it is the clear retribution on the crimes of statesmen who have sinned against the light.—*Bradford Observer*.

A weak Viceroy always tends to lean on the permanent officials, and in this way he may become the passive instrument of more mischief than a self-willed, imperious ruler would accomplish. The permanent officials in India are excellent servants when kept in their places and well supervised. But when they are allowed to dictate policy and to control the executive they become a positive danger. In dealing with the annexation of Chitral, Lord Elgin appeared to be little else than a tool in the hands of the military and civil members of his Council. So, too, in dealing with this famine, he has allowed his subordinate officials to dictate his policy, in defiance of the almost unanimous opinion of unofficial India, European as well as native.—*Newcastle Leader*.

Just now it is enough work to fight the increasing dearth; but it may be trusted that, when the crisis is over, the question of a permanent remedy will not be ignored as it has been to a great extent in the past.—*Liverpool Mercury*.

As to the Government of India, there can be no doubt that it would be able to act more easily if it had been more careful to accumulate sufficient reserves as a Famine Relief Fund, and had not spent so freely on Chitral and similar expeditions. . . . The Indian taxpayer is poor, poorer than we have any conception of.—*East Anglian Daily Times*.

A conference has been held in London at which a resolution was passed, thanking the Government for the benevolent help it was giving towards mitigating the calamitous consequences of the present famine in India, but at the same time urging the Government to take steps to restrain the drain of wealth from India, which is one of the causes of the frequent recurrence of such calamities. There seems little doubt that the Indian National Congress represents the collective opinion of the educated natives.—*Melbourne Age*.

"MILITARY ENTERPRISE AND AGGRESSION."

The first annual meeting of the Increased Armaments Protest Committee was held on Friday night in London. Dr. Spence Watson presided, and was supported by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Sir Robert Head, Mr. A. E. Fletcher, Miss Eliza Orme, Mr. W. P. Byles, Mr. William Clarke, Mr. D. Naoroji, etc.

Mr. G. H. Ferris (hon. secretary) read a letter from Mr. Labouchere, in which he said, "No one entertains a stronger opinion on this scandalous expenditure upon armaments, which are generally used to crush the weak. The late incident in Cretan waters is an instance of this misuse.

We actually have shown the sincerity of our protests against Turkish atrocities by slaying men fighting to be freed from Turkish rule, and this in order to maintain the integrity of the Turkish Empire."—Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., wrote: "I am sorry to say that I fear I shall not be well enough to take part in your meeting. But my whole sense and spirit and soul go with your purpose. Rivalry in the increase of armaments is the disease and curse of modern European States."

The Chairman, in his opening address, said the society was started in order in some way, if possible, to counteract the dangerous spirit of spurious patriotism which seemed to prevail everywhere. They were told at the outset that it was a quixotic enterprise, and that it was absurd, for they were an exceedingly small minority. It was true they were a small minority at present, but the history of minorities was one of progress. They might depend upon it that this expenditure on armaments was a business for the rich and not for the poor. The armaments gave us power to make those miserable little wars which were such a lasting disgrace to us, and by such wars rich men became richer, but they did so at a heavy cost to England and the good reputation of Great Britain. The South Africa Committee had cast much light upon these little wars. What a sorry mess the enquiry had revealed! (Hear, hear.) He anticipated it would lead to such an outburst of feeling as would put a stop to the slavery which was being carried on under the name of enforced labour, if it did nothing else. (Cheers.) We told Europe that we had no evil intentions in increasing our armaments, but no one believed it, and in response other nations began increasing their armaments. It seemed to him that our increased naval expenditure up to the present had brought about this extraordinary result, that we were to do the dirty work of despotic nations, and that those nations were to decide what the dirty work should be. Where, he asked, were the bishops while all this was going on—why were they dumb dogs when the cause of their Master was at stake? (Cheers.)

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P., moved the first resolution as follows: "That this meeting protests against the further increase of army and navy expenditure in the present year, and especially against the scheme for squandering £5,000,000 sterling on useless military works. It behoves that Great Britain could more easily than any other Great Power propose and initiate a general reduction of armaments, and that every step in the opposite direction is an aggravation of national burdens and international dangers." He said they were protesting against what Mr. Gladstone called the "wild, wanton, and most perilous expenditure in which this country is engaged." With all the misery, wretchedness, pauperism, and starvation which existed in this country, it was monstrous that the Government should play ducks and drakes with the money of the country; indeed, it was a national crime so to dissipate the resources of the country. He regarded the armaments scheme as a scheme for the murder and mutilation of human beings. He agreed with Mr. Chamberlain that it was our duty to develop markets, but as a Little Englander he said markets without murder: while the Great Englanders said murder for markets.

The resolution was seconded by Miss Orme.

Mr. W. Clarke, in supporting it, said the policy of bloated armaments was economically ruinous to the richest country in the world.

On the motion of Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., seconded by Mr. D. Naoroji, the following resolution was adopted: "That this meeting deeply regrets the destitute condition of the Indian masses, which renders them ready victims to famine, and disease, and calls upon Parliament to put a stop to the policy of military enterprise and aggression, in pursuance of which the Indian Government diverts to mischievous purposes the public money, which should be employed to improve the condition of the people."

Mr. A. E. Fletcher then moved: "That this meeting deplors the use of British forces against the Cretans and their Greek friends, and regards the recent events in the East as affording abundant proof of the uselessness for good and the power for evil of the enormous military establishments of our own and other European countries."

This was seconded by Mr. W. P. Byles, and adopted.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of *INDIA* cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of *INDIA*, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to *INDIA* (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with *INDIA*, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of *INDIA*, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of *INDIA* can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of *INDIA*, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, APRIL, 1897.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

THE telegraphic summary of Sir James Westland's financial statement is, as was of course to be expected, dressed up in a form that makes the best attainable show of a sadly dilapidated situation. In spite of famine and plague, with all their distressing concomitants, things are found to be not so bad after all; and the perennial cheerfulness of the Finance Minister is reflected in the ever rosy hopefulness of the Indian Secretary, who told the House of Commons the other night that "the credit of the Government of India has, I believe, never been appreciably higher than at the present moment." What Lord George Hamilton has in his mind to support such an airy statement will probably remain, as it now is, inscrutable. Probably, however, he is aware that only some ten days or a fortnight back the Bank of Bengal was in a position to do business at eleven or twelve per cent., if only it could have run the risks attendant on somewhat reduced reserves. We might fairly assume that any other Secretary of State would be able to assess the meaning of such a state of the money market in Calcutta as has been witnessed during, say, the past half year, especially when the monetary conditions are so exceptionally involved with the Government

balances. "Practically," said Sir James Westland so recently as last December, "almost the whole of the available current capital used in commerce is composed of the Government balances;" and the Hon. Mr. Playfair promptly endorsed the Financial Minister's statement. It is an odd situation, as regarded from London. But there it is, and it indicates in the most significant manner the overpowering influence of the Indian Treasury upon the trade of India. Such being the abnormal importance of a healthy state of Indian finance, the spectator can only regard with amazement the amiable futilities of the Indian Secretary in view of the yawning abyss into which officialism is cheerfully guiding the drift of the Treasury of India, and with the Treasury the fortunes of the Dependency.

The artificial situation, so laboriously buttressed by Sir James Westland, has again broken down. Sir James was enabled to manipulate deficits into surpluses by the aid of the import and excise duties and by the coaxing of the exchange through the gradually increasing monetary stringency. The surplus of 1895-96, Rx.1,534,000, an improvement of Rx.583,000 on the estimate of the previous year, was indebted to the rise of the rupee for little short of the whole sum. Rx.163,000 are attributed to the railways, and would be a welcome sum if the good of it went undiminished to the country where it was raised. Rx.213,000 are said to have been saved on military expenditure, a feat that recalls the emphatic declarations of General Brackenbury that military expenditure had been already pared down to the last possibility of parsimony consistent with efficiency. Either the General was mistaken then, or the efficiency of the army has been so far imperilled in the interest of the figure of the Budget. In any case, the whole situation has turned upon the sheer chances of the fluctuations of the exchange; and therefore there can be no solid satisfaction in the nominal surplus of the year.

The outstanding fact in the revised estimates of the financial year just closed is the cost of the famine, which strikes the account hard on both sides. It involves not only a vast expenditure, but also a serious loss of income. Apart from Rx.75,000 set aside for the famine in Bundelkhand in the earlier part of the year, the famine relief works are estimated to have swallowed up Rx.1,891,000. This is no doubt a heavy call upon the light purse of the Government, though it would not have been surprising if the figure had been very considerably larger, in view of the unparalleled extent and the local severities of the famine. It had been anticipated that agriculture would rather go backward during the year, but the estimated decrease of Rx.2,394,000 in land revenue cuts severely at the largest root of the

Government income. The reflection is apt to rise unbidden that a judicious distribution of a much less decrease at an early date might have been a better bargain for the Government both in rupees and in human lives. The Native States, as we have pointed out on former occasions, manage these things vastly better. The declension of the salt revenue by Rx.262,000 also tells its gruesome tale. It expresses significantly the lack of food over a large area of population, and implies a terrible diffusion of physical and mental suffering. The railway net earnings are diminished by Rx.1,231,000, in face of the exceptional movements of grain and foodstuffs generally in the campaign against the famine. This testifies to a marked constriction of the ordinary trade of the country, obviously to be connected with the distresses consequent upon famine and plague, and perhaps not remotely with the monetary stringency that has radiated its influence from Calcutta to the very ends of the Peninsula. Running up all the figures directly attributable to famine and scarcity, the financial statement totals them at Rx.6,081,000, and of this sum Rx.574,000 are charged on provincial balances, which are to this extent again discouragingly depleted. Notwithstanding this comparatively large cost of the famine visitation during 1896-97, the revised estimate shows a deficit of only Rx.1,987,000, which is a declension of only Rx.2,450,000 from the Budget figures. The improvement in exchange reinforces the position with Rx.1,329,000—a windfall resulting from the realization of 14.46d. for the rupee instead of the 13.75d. of the Budget estimate. Rx.608,000 have been saved on the military estimates, apart from the Rx.196,000 of excess expenditure attributed to the higher rates induced by the scarcity—another testimony to the possibility of safe military reductions, were there only a mind to make them. Other improvements under various heads co-operate in the same direction. Opium, however, is heading steadily downwards; it shows a loss of Rx.419,000. China is pressing the competition, and the exchange difficulty between the countries operates against India. The decrease was, or ought to have been, anticipated. Before dismissing the year now closed, we may usefully repeat that the sheer luck of exchange has saved the deficit from being all but doubled.

Will the rupee continue to be forced higher—perhaps to the desired 16d.? Sir James Westland's hopes turn strongly in that direction, for he has adopted the last year's rate of 14.46d. as the basis of his Budget Estimate for 1897-98. The deficit he forecasts at Rx.2,464,000. He anticipates that the relief of famine will absorb Rx.3,641,000, and that the consequences of famine will reduce the land revenue by Rx.447,000, and the railway earnings by

Rx.917,000, while opium will go worse by the large sum of Rx.1,139,000. In addition, he calculates advances to rayats to the extent of Rx.800,000. Military expenditure, however, strange to tell, is to be lessened by Rx.511,000, last year having included, we are told, expenditure for special mobilisation. The total expenditure on famine relief for both years Sir James puts down at Rx.5,607,000, "but much depends," he adds, "upon future prospects as to weather and crops." The saving clause is obviously essential. The fact is that the forecast is the merest guessing in the dark. No man can tell what the famine will cost. The figure may be 12, as easily as 6, millions; it will certainly not fall within the estimate. It must further be insisted on that the Finance Minister is placing his hopes on the high exchange with something of the daring of despair. Looking to the operating causes of the rate, it must also be impressed once more that they tend steadily and heavily to the crippling and disorganisation of trade. No doubt, the contemplated loan of £3,500,000 in England will go some way to strengthen exchange, although the result can hardly have the happiest effect upon the contemplated loan of four crores to be raised in India, unless counterbalanced by anxious English investors. Besides these loans, it is intended to add another £1,000,000 sterling to the temporary debt. And so the miserable country is persistently plunged deeper and deeper into the mire of debt inextricable. The loans, we shall of course be told, will be productive; for is not the railway system to be pushed forward briskly in accordance with the policy explained a year ago? Rx.10,130,000 are to be spent on railways in 1897-98, "besides Rx.2,470,000 and Rx.3,281,000 spent "by branch lines and other companies not under "direct guarantee." We never hesitated to stretch a point to build a railway for fighting famine, but that object is officially proclaimed to be no longer available. So far as railways can control famine, the work is done. We never doubted the value of railways for the development of the country, within the limits of the country's ability to afford means of development. But the present furor for railways is wholly unjustifiable in presence of the pressure upon the finances, and the derivative pressure upon the whole trade of the country; and it is flaunted in the face of the English public simply and solely, in our opinion, as a material argument to confound those of us who denounce the official optimism as to the state of the Calcutta Treasury and of the country at large. To our minds, the unsound position is aggravated more and more with every year. Every year we are being carried away further and more rapidly from the possibility of a healthy development, which can alone retrieve the finances of India—and enrich the English trader.

THREE ANNIVERSARIES AND A CONTRAST.

THE formal celebration of the sixtieth anniversary of Her Majesty's accession has been fixed for the twenty-second of June, but already the rejoicings of the nation have taken concrete form in the shape of the Prince of Wales's Hospital Fund, and the promotion of other charitable objects, while the Vice-regal Court at Dublin has expressed its feelings of thankfulness in traditional English fashion by giving a great banquet. The Egyptians thought it not incongruous with festivity to display to the banqueters a mummy, the emblem of man's end. So ancient and excellent a precedent may be pleaded by those who would remind a nation in its hour of gladness that this present year of grace, the sixtieth anniversary of the commencement of a glorious reign, is the fortieth anniversary of the Indian Mutiny, and the twentieth anniversary of the proclamation of Victoria, Empress of India, and the inauguration of the new policy. That the year will be famous in the annals of India as the year of tribulation goes without saying. Whether it will be marked also with a white stone as the beginning of a new era of justice for India, or only with a black stone as the culmination of two decades of depression, will depend on the ability of the English people to appreciate the contrast between the condition of England and India after sixty years of a beneficent reign. It is a common boast that India is ruled by Englishmen for her own good. Englishmen are fond of quoting with approval the opinion of a popular French writer, that the British are the best rulers in the world. The conclusion is obvious. How comes it, then, that the plight of India at the present moment is so pitiable while England is so prosperous? No doubt there have been famines and plagues of old time. No doubt, too, British rule compares on the whole favourably with any which has preceded it. But it does not necessarily follow that the utter prostration of India is due solely to unavoidable causes; much less does it follow that British rule has attained a high or even a satisfactory standard of excellence. Indeed, it cannot at present bear contrast with the administration of the twenty years following the mutiny. To compare it with the administration at home is palpably absurd. Yet if there were any sufficient ground for official self-satisfaction such a comparison should surely be not impossible. Therefore it is with no intention of making any unworthy appeal to fear, but rather in the hope of arousing a more active and intelligent interest in the welfare of our Indian fellow-subjects, that we would divert attention for a moment from the grounds of rejoicing in the "diamond jubilee," and beg politicians to consider how

far the lessons of the Mutiny have been taken to heart and consistently adopted as a basis of policy; and whether the good omen of the proclamation of Her Majesty's imperial power in India—that significant parallel to the transference of a Roman province from senatorial to imperial control—has been followed, as in Roman times, by such an improvement as it portended.

The welfare of a nation is not altogether a matter of finance, it is true; but there is something almost pathetic in the repetition of an experience known to all enquirers into India's hardships, the inevitable reduction of nearly every problem to terms of crores and lakhs. Unhappy indeed is a people which finds in its poverty the source of all its sorrows; whose struggles to exist almost preclude the possibility of higher aspirations. Yet such is the position of India. The steadily increasing calls on the exchequer have only been met by increased taxation, and the raising of new loans. While England finds it possible to liquidate the huge charges imposed on her by the maintenance of an army and a navy proportionate to the extent of her ever-increasing commerce and her empire, with little or no recourse to fresh imposts and no violation of her principles of free trade, India, whose territory is, but for unprofitable accessions, stationary, and whose relations to the rest of the world have not radically changed for three centuries, is forced as a last resort to tax her own productions and impose duties that hamper her trade. The chief sources of English revenue, excise and income tax, both bearing a direct relation to the prosperity of the people, prove by their steady increase and their excess over estimate the elasticity of English finance. The chief source of Indian revenue, the land tax, with its extreme assessment and its cast-iron rigidity independent of the prosperity of the taxpayer, stands in painful contrast. With an expanding revenue and a steadily decreasing National Debt, Parliament shows no tendency to grudge necessary expenditure, yet at the same time submits every item in the Budget to a close and prolonged examination and discussion extending over many sittings. On the other hand, the Indian Budget, drawn up by a practically irresponsible council, imposed on a people which has no means of protecting its own interests, dealing with as large a total as the English Budget, and supplying repeated deficits by recourse to repeated loans, is passed by a scanty House in one afternoon's sitting. What a satire is this on the traditional British love of fair play! Lord Lansdowne's suggestion that the transference of India to the flag of the United States, for instance, might greatly affect her financial exigencies, is a notable hint to the advocates of a so-called Imperial policy. We may decline with Lord Lansdowne to discuss the

applicability of English methods of financial control to India, and refuse to affirm even as an academic statement of right that taxation confers a claim to representation. But we have no hesitation in concurring with Mr. Naoroji's position that the Government of India has forfeited its claims on our confidence, and should not be trusted with control of finance any more than the executive at home is so trusted. "Taxation implies representation" was never an axiom of the British or of any other constitution. But the right to good government is an inalienable one, and an administration which has failed as the Indian administration has undoubtedly failed in matters of finance, should certainly be put under popular control of some kind. The latest Budget is in itself a confession of incompetence and perversity. There is no attempt to reduce expenditure, and resort will have to be had to loans of eight millions sterling. Mr. Playfair, speaking at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce in Calcutta on March 12th, found room for congratulation in the great expansion of Indian trade during the present reign, and the large amount of capital invested in India. On the other hand, a consideration of the great excess of exports over imports, and of the proportion of interest on railway capital which is paid out of taxation, tends to damp enthusiasm over the mere increase of the aggregate of imports and exports, and the amount of invested capital. Large investments of foreign capital are by no means an unmixed blessing. If such energetic communities as the Australian colonies found themselves in severe financial distress four years ago through excessive importation of foreign capital, it may reasonably be inferred that India would, if consulted, decline compliments to her credit so dangerous as those implied in the recurrence of British loans.

Inelastic methods of finance, unsuited to the conditions of India, have depleted her grain stocks, while the railway rates found necessary to enable the State-guaranteed lines to pay part of their dividends have tended to reduce the area under cultivation for export. In face of a famine the country lies abject and helpless, with no reserves. The plundering of the provincial balances for Imperial purposes has checked the adoption of essential sanitary measures, and left the towns powerless to struggle with the plague. Time was when fires performed the work of destruction healthful to crowded districts. But municipal councils with straitened means, while guarding against fire, have found themselves unable to adopt regular and more modern methods of sanitation. So at a crisis a paternal government is compelled forcibly if politely to suspend the municipal councils of Karachi, Bombay, and Calcutta, and undertake the improvement which

chiefly its own extravagance has rendered impossible hitherto. If a third of the money spent on military departments during the last twenty years had been devoted to sanitary works and famine reserve, neither famine nor plague would have been in the slightest degree difficult to control. The passive submission of a people who have been made for centuries the victims of successive conquests, and their unaffected loyalty even in the midst of the most terrible disasters, instead of inspiring in their rulers a feeling of shame for their own conscious shortcomings, have begotten in them an overweening self-confidence, and an arbitrary habit of making Indian interests subservient to what they conceive to be Imperial interests. It is not to be doubted that if the British electorate could be aroused to a sense of the importance of the questions at issue, their instinctive love of justice would insist on remedial legislation. Parliament votes nearly fifty millions annually for army and navy expenses. The army at home is sometimes said to be mainly a reserve for the British army in India. The chief portion of the money voted for new naval construction in the last five years has gone to the formation of two powerful homogeneous squadrons for the Channel and for the Mediterranean, the latter squadron being maintained, we are told, in the interests of our Indian empire. Yet in spite of these concrete proofs of the importance England attaches to the retention of India, the House of Commons, face to face with the desperate situation of India, allows itself to be lulled to its customary apathy by the honeyed words of Anglo-Indian officials, and is complimented by Lord George Hamilton on its subservience. "On the whole the House of Commons has treated the matter (of the famine) with remarkable consideration, but occasionally questions were put by individual members which shewed that they did not in any way realize the magnitude of our rule in India, or the masses of people we there governed. Though a casualty might occur here and there, the organization in itself was equal to the strain put upon it." The man who flatters our faults is a dangerous friend. There is considerable risk that if the present opportunity for insisting on a full enquiry on the lines suggested by Sir William Wedderburn, to supplement the evidence before the Finance Committee, be lost, Parliament may again be lulled to sleep until the next disaster, which may come sooner than we anticipate. There is all the more danger that our obvious duty may be overlooked in the preparations for national rejoicings, and our consciences soothed by the warm glow of generous virtue as we contemplate the rising total of the Mansion House Fund. That as far as in us lies we may prevent the continuance of a state of things at once unjust and fraught with danger to

the Empire, we have ventured to recall the consequences of our apathy in 1857, of the promise implied in the proclamation in India of Victoria the Good, in 1877, and the contrast between the promise and the performance which has so grievously aggravated the disaster of this year of rejoicing in England, and of mourning in India—1897.

LONGFELLOW.¹

It is tempting, but it would be unfair, to regard the inclusion of Longfellow in a series of "Oxford Poets" printed at the University Press as a sort of canonization of a popular favourite. It would be unfair, because the University presumably does not make itself responsible for the publications of Mr. Frowde; but it is tempting, for in any case admission to such a series of poets is a distinction, and the fact that Longfellow has attained it is a convenient starting-point for some useful reflections. If we set aside those to whom the critical have never allowed the name of poet at all—the Martin Tupper and Eliza Cooks, whose gilt-edged volumes still please their indiscriminating patrons—there is probably no poet in whose case such a complete divergence exists between the critical and uncritical estimates. If we are to gauge the greatness of a poet (after the fashion lately adopted by at least one literary paper) by the sales of his books, Longfellow would come next after Shakespeare and Milton on the list of English-speaking poets; perhaps his place would be even above Milton. On the other hand, the critical ignore his very existence. As the æsthetic undergraduate said, when pigs were mentioned in conversation, "I have never seen any," so the cultured critic might answer, if asked what he thought of Longfellow's poems, "I have never read any." The fact that he has never read Longfellow would not, of course, prevent our critic from delivering himself of a sarcasm on the shortcomings of the American domesticated muse and the untutored taste of her admirers. Now, it is unfortunately true that the appreciation of poetry, as of any other fine art, requires a special training. But the absolute divergence of cultured and uncultured taste is an evil with far-reaching consequences. Criticism may do something to increase or diminish the divergence. The critic who is anxious to prove his own superiority will naturally emphasize the points of disagreement; the critic who cares for the future of literature will be more solicitous to distinguish the sound from the unsound instincts of uncultivated admirers, and to acknowledge what is sound at least as cheerfully as he rejects what is unsound. To say,

¹ "Longfellow's Poetical Works." The Oxford Poets. London: Henry Frowde.

as a superior critic did the other day, that the ordinary admirer of Wordsworth admires him for the unpoetical elements in his work may possibly inspire awe of the critical faculty in a humble-minded reader, but it can serve no useful purpose. It mystifies the plain man instead of helping him to a better judgment; and, besides, it is not true. If we look fairly into the causes of Longfellow's popularity, we shall find both positive and negative reasons for it. Positively, it is due to his possession of certain good qualities; negatively, it is due to the absence in the mass of the public of that fine literary fastidiousness which makes his common-places almost intolerable to those who have once learnt the charm of great and perfect art. It is right to lay bare the second reason; criticism must tell the truth even at the risk of hurting the feelings of estimable people. But it is not right to ignore the first reason, and so to widen the gulf between the cultured and the uncultured. It is but a sham Wisdom that takes her stand in the market-place, crying, "Seek ye me early and ye shall not find me!"

A story that won a success somewhat out of proportion to its merits a few years ago owed part of its popularity to its title, which was borrowed from a line of Longfellow's—"Ships that pass in the night and speak to each other in passing." The metaphor pleased the popular fancy, and for some months it became a favourite occupation for young ladies to hunt for the line in their Longfellows—a search not often crowned with success, as the line occurred in one of his later poems that was only published in the copyright editions. It is not likely, by the way, that Longfellow was guilty of any plagiarism, even unconscious, but almost the identical words, "Gone as a ship that passes in the night," occur in Clough's "Dipsychus," and Clough uses a very similar idea in two other poems, "Sic Itur" and "Qua Cursum Ventus." The image in the latter poem—

"As ships becalmed at eve that lay
With canvas drooping, side by side,
Two towers of sail at dawn of day
Are scarce long leagues apart descried:
When fell the night, upsprung the breeze,
And all the darkling hours they plied;
Nor dreamt but each the self-same seas
By each was cleaving, side by side."

is finer in itself and far more beautifully wrought than the simile in Longfellow. It is characteristic of the injustice with which the popular voice, when left to itself, awards literary distinction, that Clough's poem remains comparatively unknown, while Longfellow's line has become a household word. But, in spite of this, the line of Longfellow (if we assume its originality, which it would be ill-natured to dispute)

has real merit, real suggestiveness, real pathos, and owes its success to its good qualities.

In the words real suggestiveness, real pathos, we have already touched upon two of the secrets of Longfellow's popularity. The poet, has been defined as "one who sees the infinite in things." The great poets, seeing into the very heart of infinity, often dazzle the ordinary mind with excess of light, so that it is only blinded, not illuminated. Longfellow sees only a little way into infinity, but he sees further than the unpoetical man, and therefore he helps him. When he says, for instance—

"Each man's chimney is his golden milestone,
Is the central point from which he measures
Every distance

Through the gateways of the world around him,"

the thought and the expression are commonplace enough, but they are perfectly sincere, and they are at least a shade less commonplace than the average man's average thoughts, even when he is doing his best to be poetical. For the same reason, Longfellow is particularly helpful to children, on whom all but the most simple, objective, concrete passages in the great poets are usually thrown away. So, too, with the pathos. Its range is limited, but it is perfectly genuine. If he passes outside his proper sphere, he fails at once. How puny are the characters in his "Golden Legend" beside Marlowe's "Faustus" or Goethe's "Faust"! The great tragedian, as Professor T. H. Green profoundly said, shows us man "standing in the strength" of his own spirit, remaking the world by its power."

"Let us place ourselves, by the poet's help, within the soul of Lear or Hamlet, and we shall be able to follow the process by which the spiritual power, taking the form of passion in one and of thought in the other, and working outwards, draws everything into its own unity. . . . The incidents of the tragedy are wholly subordinate, issuing either from the spiritual energy of the actors, on the one hand, or, on the other, from destiny, to whose throne the poet penetrates."

Here we have a function of art wholly beyond the powers of Longfellow, and beyond the understanding of most of his readers. Indeed, his greater contemporary Tennyson scarcely ever attained to it. One remembers the delight with which Mr. John Morley hailed the appearance of "The Ring and the Book." "The ethics of the rectory parlour set to sweet music," he wrote, "the respectable aspirations of the sentimental curate married to exquisite verse, the everlasting glorification of domestic sentiment in blameless princes and others, as if that were the poet's single province, as if domestic sentiment summed up and included the whole throng of passions, emotions, strife, and desire—all this might seem to be making valetudinarians of us all." After Tennyson's "medieval knights masquerading in nineteenth-century evening-dress"—so one dis-

satisfied reader described them—the undiluted villainy of Browning's Count Guido was felt to be a relief. And many American readers must have turned with very similar feelings from Longfellow to Whitman. In Whitman they found, as his latest American critic writes, more of "that pristine element, something akin to the unbreathed air of mountain and shore, which makes the arterial blood of poetry and literature," than in any other modern writer. Longfellow's poetry, his apologist must admit, is somewhat anæmic. Only (to turn the metaphor about a little) let us add that those who want literature to furnish them with a tonic should take care to apply for it to the great poets, who see life steadily and see it whole, not to the quacks of so-called "realism."

In saying all this it may seem that we have made Longfellow out to be a very minor poet indeed. But, though it may well be doubted whether his work contains enough of the "pristine element" to ensure its immortality, it has valuable qualities that minor poetry generally lacks. Not the least of these is its cheerfulness. The minor poet is generally dolorous; Longfellow is as optimistic as Browning, whose characteristic note was, "God's in his Heaven; all's right with the world." As a rule, the minor poet appeals to an extremely limited audience. Most often he has no really individual note; his poetry is but an echo. If he has an individual note, it is apt to be a mannerism that repels more readers than it attracts. But Longfellow has both individuality and width of appeal. No one else has rendered in quite the same way, for instance, the charm of old-world Flemish or German cities. It is often from him, dweller in a world where nothing is old but "the forest primordial," that the English child first hears the names of Bruges and Nuremberg, and falls under the spell of the Middle Ages. It is often, too, in his poetry that the child first catches the echoes of the old Norse Sagas, or learns the romance of the North American Indians. His metres, again, have great freshness and variety, and some of them, including his hexameters, possess a curious fascination for the untutored ear. There are few minor poets of whom so much could be said, and his great historic service has still to be mentioned. Probably no one has done so much to unite the English-speaking races of the East and West by the bond of a common literary sympathy. No true lover of literature, surely, would wish to disparage the greatness of that achievement, or rashly to deny that one who accomplished so much had "spoken things worthy of Phœbus."

"No one disputes that there will be occasional droughts and consequent failure of crops in India. But it does not follow that whenever crops fail there must be famine."—PROFESSOR BEESLY.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Mr. D. E. Wacha, of the Bombay Presidency Association, and Professor G. K. Gokhale, of the Deccan Sabha, have arrived in London, and are expected shortly to give evidence before Lord Welby's Commission on Indian Expenditure.

It is not expected that the sittings of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure will continue much longer. A bulky Blue-book containing the first portion of the evidence was issued a few months ago, and since the sittings of the Commission were resumed in January last important evidence has been heard from Lord Northbrook, Lord Roberts, Lord Ripon, Lord Lansdowne, Sir Henry Waterfield, and others. At the latest sitting before we go to press Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was called as a witness. He has handed in to the Commission a series of valuable memoranda, dealing chiefly with the poverty of India, and setting forth his well-known views as to the deep-lying economic dangers of the existing system. It is understood that these documents will be regarded as Mr. Naoroji's evidence in chief, upon which he will be cross-examined by his colleagues on the Commission. After him some other Indian witnesses will be heard, and the Commission is expected shortly afterwards to consider its report. Having enquired into Indian expenditure, Lord Welby and his colleagues might well devote their attention to the hardly less important questions connected with Indian revenue and taxation.

Major Raseli has given notice that he will, at an early date, call the attention of the House of Commons to the Health of the British Army in India; and move a Resolution.

In recognition of services rendered in connexion with the relief of Chitral, the Queen has approved of the following corps being permitted to bear the word "Chitral" on their colours or appointments:—The Buffs (East Kent Regiment), Bedfordshire Regiment, King's Own Scottish Borderers, East Lancashire Regiment, King's Royal Rifle Corps, Seaforth Highlanders (Ross-shire Buffs, the Duke of Albany's), and Gordon Highlanders. Perhaps a more suitable inscription would be "India pays."

The *New Saturday*, of March 20th, following up a previous article on the crisis in Bhopal (to which reference has been made in our columns) wrote:—

"However things may result, what is now inevitable is an independent British enquiry into the allegations specifically submitted. . . . The Government of India, we know, will do nothing if it can possibly help in such a case. It relies on the ignorance of the people at home. It remains for the people at home to lend the weight of their opinion to the modest request of the expatriated and oppressed people of Bhopal. For it is on the people at home, ill-informed as they necessarily are, and preoccupied with laborious trifles as they are constantly kept by every Government, Liberal and Conservative in turn, that lies the final and awful responsibility for what is done, or not done, in their name in India."

The *Reformer*, a vigorous little "monthly" which was issued for the first time on March 15th last, gives the first place in its first number to the Indian famine, which it rightly describes as more

important to England than the Cretan dispute. The writer concludes as follows:—

"One man can do something, but not much. Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Naoroji and Sir W. Wedderburn have each in turn done something; but give India representation, let her send delegates to her own Council Chamber, where she can watch over her own interests, with a closer knowledge of her needs and her capabilities than is possible to any non-resident Englishman, and then her future will be to a considerable extent in her own hands. In the meantime all available funds and all available energy should be concentrated in the effort to relieve the famine-stricken millions in Hindostan."

The *Investors' Review*, which, as was to be expected of Mr. A. J. Wilson, has always taken a strong and independent line on Indian questions, contained in its March number a further article upon the meaning of the Indian famine. We extract this vigorous passage:—

"India is overloaded. We keep pouring millions more of our money into the country every year, and this helps to disguise the ravages of our forcing system of 'progress' upon the recuperative and vital powers of the country. But, though it may be that ten or twelve millions sterling fresh capital per annum, 'invested' in India every year relieves the strain of her pre-existing obligations to us—enriching a certain diminishing class among the people in the by-going—none the less is it as sure as the succession of generations of men, that the end of this policy is not strength but exhaustion. Of what use is it to cover the land with railways when the people have no money to pay for the food these railways could carry? The country is drained, not fed, by these expensive undertakings, and can no more stand up under the frightful obligations we have bound upon the people's backs, than we could endure to take over its loads were it to succumb to over-pressure. From this point of view the famine now raging may be looked at as one more warning to us to make haste and put our house in order."

The Indian famine is no laughing matter, but some of the "comments" which it has provoked in the British Press decidedly are. One of the richest of these is the sapient discovery of the *Nottingham Guardian* that Sir William Harcourt's democratic Budget of 1894 is at the bottom of it all. Here is the amazing passage—taken (need we say?) from a "leading article":—

"We have no desire to make political capital out of such a subject, but we are perfectly satisfied that part of the proceeds of the new estate duty will be paid by the half-starved Indian peasant. People who are compelled to make large provision for the demands the State will make upon their property at their death cannot, if they would, contribute as generously as they have been accustomed to do to charitable purposes, and hence it will be found that Radical finance, which was supposed to tax only the rich, has heavily taxed every kind of public charity."

Upon this encouraging text, "S.L.H." offered some pertinent remarks in the *Morning Leader*:—

"The notion is that the poor millionaires are so bothered with heavy taxation that they will not, or cannot, subscribe to charities. The only logical outcome would, of course, be to allow millionaires to go untaxed altogether so that they will have lots to give away. And it follows clearly enough that you ought to clap all the taxation on the very poor, because, roughly speaking, they give nothing away, so the difference would not be noticed. I hope Sir William Harcourt as duly penitent now for his misdeeds when he finds that amongst other trifles he is responsible for starvation in India! . . . I put it to any fair-minded starving man, who is huddled up at night on the Embankment or in Trafalgar-square, is it fair that these poor creatures who inherit their hundreds of thousands and millions (for which they have actually done nothing at all, so it is not their fault)—as it fair, I ask, that they should be taxed? I am sure that the age of chivalry has not gone, and the starving tramp will put in a word or two for the harassed millionaire, who would like to contribute to the Indian Famine Fund, but, according to the *Nottingham Guardian*, cannot, because of that wicked 'Aroucort.'"

INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

MR. W. S. CAINE'S RETURN FROM INDIA.

MEETING AT THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB.

Sir William Wedderburn, on Tuesday, March 9th, gave a reception and luncheon at the National Liberal Club to welcome Mr. W. S. Caine on his return from the Indian National Congress, which he attended as the delegate of the British Committee. Sir William presided at the luncheon, and had on his right the guest of the day and on his left Lord Kinnaird.

There were four Vice-chairmen, viz., Mr. H. J. Wilson M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. H. N. Haridas and Mr. W. Martin Wood; while the guests also included Mr. Burt, M.P., Mr. F. W. Cawley, M.P., Mr. Geo. Harwood, M.P., Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P., Mr. J. Herbert Lewis, M.P., Sir J. Leng, M.P., Mr. Swift McNeill, M.P., Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., Mr. J. Herbert Roberts, M.P., Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., Mr. C. E. Schwann, M.P., Mr. Robinson Souttar, M.P., Mr. John Wilson, M.P. (Govan), Prince Ranjitsinghi, Sir Geo. Birdwood, and Messrs W. Digby, the Hon. Conrad Dillon, A. E. Fletcher, A. G. Symonds, A. J. Wilson, and Fisher Unwin, and the Hon. Mr. Justice Jardine. Over 70 sat down to luncheon.

After luncheon, the Chairman asked the company to drink the health of the Queen Empress. (Cheers.) This, he said, is a toast which in India is always received with the greatest enthusiasm, because Indians will never forget that after she had reigned twenty years her Majesty personally gave them the great Queen's Proclamation of 1858, which they regard as the Magna Charta of India. (Cheers.) They will never forget that, in speaking of the people of India, she said, "In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward." (Cheers.) Well, gentlemen, forty years have passed since that time, and this year there will be great celebrations of triumph all over the Empire for great prosperity has accrued to the British Empire. But, sad to say, India alone lies prostrate, and therefore we may hope that her Majesty will not forget India, and as we know she personally intervened to put the words I have quoted into the Proclamation of 1858, we trust that the personal intervention will be again exercised in this Diamond Jubilee, so that India may not be forgotten. (Cheers.)

The toast was duly honoured.

The CHAIRMAN: There are some of our friends invited who were not able to attend, but have written letters regretting that they cannot be here to welcome Mr. Caine. I will read but two of them. The first is from Sir William Hunter, a great authority upon Indian matters. He writes:—

"Oaken Holt, Near Oxford,
March 6th, 1897.

"My Dear Wedderburn,—I much regret being unable to be present at your luncheon to welcome home Mr. Caine. But, as you are probably aware, I have to preside at a Famine Relief meeting on that afternoon, and so must prefer duty to pleasure. I beg you will remember me kindly to your guest, and I feel sure that the gathering will be a cordial and sympathetic one. We all have the interest of India at heart, and little differences in our methods of working should not be allowed to obscure our identity of aim.

"Ever sincerely yours,
"W. W. HUNTER."

The other letter is from Mr. Alfred Webb, who presided at the previous Congress, and whom we had the pleasure of entertaining in this room two years ago. It is as follows:—

"11, Frankfort Avenue, Rathgar, Dublin,
March 6th.

"Dear Sir William,—Illness has prevented my acknowledging your kind invitation for the 9th. Even still I have to employ an amanuensis.

"Were it possible, nothing would give me greater pleasure than to be one of the company to welcome Mr. Caine back. I have followed his course in India, and he is worthy of all honour. How beneficial it would be to both countries if men of his calibre and clear-sightedness oftener visited India.

"It is deplorable the general ignorance here prevailing

regarding the Congress movement. By here I mean the United Kingdom at large.

"It is amazing how difficult it is to rouse public interest on the question, the most important of all others to the future of the Empire, I do not even exclude the Home Rule question, to which I have given so much of my life. People appear blinded to the overwhelming importance of the political and educational forces at present at work in India, and which sooner or later will work their way—whether for good or ill largely depends on the manner in which we meet or help to guide them.

"I am very sincerely yours,
"ALFRED WEBB.

"SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P."

Among those who have also written expressing their regret at not being able to attend are: Mr. T. R. Buchanan, M.P., Sir Charles Cameron, M.P., Dr. Clark, M.P., Mr. Michael Davitt, M.P., Mr. J. E. Ellis, M.P., Mr. Charles Harrison, M.P., Sir Robert T. Reid, M.P., Mr. C. P. Scott, M.P., the Hon. Philip Stanhope, M.P., Mr. E. T. Cook, Mr. H. W. Massingham, Dr. Clifford, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Sir John Budd Phear, Mr. Geo. W. E. Russell, Dr. Guinness Rogers, and Sir James Stansfeld. The object of our meeting this morning is to give a hearty welcome to our friend Mr. Caine, upon his return from India, and to say how glad we are that he has come back safe and sound. (Hear, hear.) We wish also to tender to him our thanks for his services in India. At considerable personal risk he has visited that country in order to be the delegate to the 12th Indian National Congress, and to carry to the people of India a message of good will and of deep sympathy in their sufferings. (Hear.) For, gentlemen, a double calamity has now fallen on India. To the famine pestilence is superadded, and, whatever efforts may be made there will, no doubt, be great misery and great loss of life. We know that twenty years ago, when there was a famine, no fewer than five millions of people perished, and what will be the number to perish on this occasion no one knows. The problem how to avert disaster is a very difficult one. Here in this island we have a population of 40 millions, and with the people of this country rests the whole power and the whole responsibility. And 6,000 miles away there is India with its 300,000,000 inhabitants: they have none of the power, but they have all the need and all the suffering. The problem is a difficult one. The only thing is for us all to work together with mutual goodwill and confidence; the Government must do all that it possibly can, and the natural leaders of the people must do all that they can, but even that will not suffice unless all work heartily together. (Hear, hear.) What we want is solidarity in facing this question, in order to bring together public opinion in this country and in India. To do this our friend Mr. Caine recently undertook this journey to India. He has not only attended the meetings of the Congress, but he has visited many local centres and been present at gatherings at which delegates to the Congress were elected. I hope that he will tell us something of his experience, in order that those present may judge of the real substance and basis of this movement for the benefit of the people. (Hear.) I should explain that at one time it was doubtful whether the Indian Congress would meet this year; so great were the difficulties and hardships, and so occupied were the people in their own homes, that some thought it would be better not to meet at all. I think it was highly to their credit that all those difficulties were overcome, and delegates assembled from districts long distances apart, and were able to place before the Government their past experience of famine difficulties, together with suggestions as to the best means of overcoming them. What they want to impress upon the Government is this: that it is not enough to deal with the present famine—(hear)—in dealing with the question it is not the mere superficial symptoms that must be got rid of, but you must strike at the cause of the disease. (Hear.) The universal belief of Indian public opinion is that the originating cause of the disaster is the extreme poverty and destitution of the people—this poverty and destitution being so great that the people are unable to resist even the first attacks of pestilence and famine. That was the opinion of the Indian National Congress, and we, who are the friends of India in Parliament, as in duty bound, brought that view of the case before Parliament. I am grateful to those members of the House who are here, and to those who have not been able to come to-day, for the support they

gave me in bringing the matter before Parliament. An amendment was moved. We did not even ask that the Government should accept this statement of the Indian Congress; we only asked for an enquiry in order that it might be ascertained whether or not the universal feeling of the people of India was founded upon fact and truth. (Hear, hear.) I am sorry to say—and I say it with deep regret—(hear)—that the Secretary of State refused this enquiry: he not only refused it, but he also made what I consider to be an altogether uncalled for attack upon the Congress. Lord George Hamilton took up a very extraordinary position in this matter. The very justification for our action in the House was that we took it on behalf of a great representative body in India; and his great objection to my proposal was that it emanated from the Indian National Congress, instead of that being considered, as it really was, the greatest recommendation it could have had. (Cheers.) He not only made this attack upon the Congress, but he further ridiculed the claims of the Congress to be a representative body, and I am sorry to say he also taunted the Congress with unresistance to help in mitigating the famine. Now, as regards that taunt I think I should like my friend Mr. Cairns, who has been through India, to say whether it is a deserved taunt. (Mr. CAIRNS: It is not.) My own belief is that the Indian people are the most charitable people on the face of the earth. (Hear, hear.) They have no poor law, because in time of disaster they show a marked feeling of brotherhood in helping one another, and I believe it will be found that the leaders of the Congress have been among the first to help the people during this famine. (Hear, hear.) Then, as regards Lord George Hamilton ridiculing the claims of the Congress to be representative. I should like to say a word about that. I will not give my own opinion, but I will quote that of a most undeniable authority in answer to the Secretary of State, who has never been in India, and does not consequently know very much about it. Our friend Sir R. Garth, a Conservative Chief Justice of Bengal, who has been in India and does know a great deal about that empire—(hear)—in an article in the *Law Magazine and Review*, refers to this question, and says:—"The Indian National Congress is a large, influential and important assembly of earnest and patriotic gentlemen, who, since 1885, have, at the close of each year, met at one or other of the large centres in India, such as Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay, to discuss their political views and opinions. They consist of delegates from every part of India, who are duly elected at a number of divisional headquarters. We are told that at the Congress meeting in Allahabad in the year 1888 fully three millions of men took a direct part in the election of these delegates, who themselves numbered no fewer than 1,248. The constitution of this important body was thoroughly representative; it consisted of princes, rajahs, nawabs, fifty-four members of noble families, members of Council, honorary magistrates, chairmen and commissioners of municipalities, fellows of universities, members of local boards, and professional men, such as engineers, merchants, bankers, journalists, landed proprietors, shop-keepers, clergymen, priests, professors of colleges, zemindars, and others. I should also say that they were thoroughly representative as regards religion, as well as their rank and profession. The Hindus of various castes numbered 964, the Muhammadans, 222; the Christians, 38; and the Jains, 11." Then Sir Richard Garth goes on to enquire what these men have done to merit the relentless persecution of the Government of India. And he answers his own question as follows: "What have they done? I will tell you what they have done. They have dared to think for themselves, and not only for themselves, but for the millions of poor and ignorant people who compose our Indian Empire. (Cheers.) They have been content to sacrifice their own interest and to brave the displeasure of the Government in order to lend a helping hand to these poor people." (Cheers.) Well, gentlemen, bearing in mind that these are the aims of this Indian National Congress, I ask is that a body to whom a responsible Minister of the Crown should refuse a hearing? Are these men to be treated contemptuously? Is there any reason for doing that? I say that there is none. (Cheers.) I very much regret that Lord George Hamilton and others who have filled the position of Secretary of State for India have never had an opportunity of meeting this Congress of wise men from the East. (Hear, hear.) The other day I asked in the House whether the Secretary of State would not consider the propriety of inviting some representative and experienced Indian gentlemen to sit on his Council. I think he need not have gone far to find at least one such,

gentleman; he could have invited our friend Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji—(cheers)—who occupies a position quite unique in the love, affection, and confidence of the people of India—(cheers)—whether in or out of Parliament—and I hope he will soon be in Parliament again—(hear)—he will ever remain the one single member for India. (Cheers.) If Secretaries of State would take opportunities of meeting men like him—men of the experienced older generation—they would probably consider the claims of India with a little more respect. And then, too, consider the young men who come to this country. We have not yet got simultaneous examinations in London and in India, so that candidates from India are heavily handicapped. Yet India, after all, has had the gratification of seeing Mr. Chatterjee out-distance all his competitors in the examination for the Civil Service of India. (Hear, hear.) Again, in science we have recently heard from Professor Bose his discoveries in light and electricity, which have gained for him the admiration of men of science throughout Europe. Then, too, we have our distinguished friend Prince Ranjitsingh: has he not taught us how to play our national game? (Cheers.) It seems to me that under the circumstances it is most monstrous that a hearing should be refused to the claims of men like these. (Hear.) It says very little for the wisdom with which we are governed and with which India is governed that the Government of India should treat in a hostile way these men who constitute the Indian National Congress, and who are doing their utmost to teach the Government how the people of India may be made prosperous and contented under British rule. (Cheers.) But I must return to our friend Mr. Cairns. I should like to say how very much we feel his absence from the House of Commons. His inexhaustible energy, his ready resource and his vigorous speech were of the utmost value to us. We hope he will very soon regain his post there. (Cheers.) Not that being in the House and attending to Indian affairs is altogether a bed of roses—(laughter)—especially when you have to bring matters before a careless and indifferent House, when you have to face a powerful Ministerial bench with a majority of 150 behind it, and especially as, I am sorry to say, is the case, we got no help from the front Opposition bench such as we have a right to expect. Indeed, an ex-Secretary of State seems always waiting an opportunity to attack us in the rear. His proceedings remind me somewhat of what was said of Austria in King John: "Thou ever strong upon the stronger side." (Laughter.) And he speaks on Indian matters with all that ease and assurance which go with practical ignorance of the subject. (Cheers and laughter.) We are very weak in the House of Commons, and need all the support that public opinion can give us. But I am very glad to think that the Press is strongly represented at our meeting to-day, and I wish to tender our grateful thanks to the independent press for the assistance and support they invariably give us. I even feel a certain amount of gratitude to the hostile press—the *Pioneer*, the *Globe*, and the *St. James's Gazette*, for they pay a tribute to our little efforts as is proved by their sometimes losing their temper and falling into personalities. (Laughter.) It is always gratifying to see one's opponents lose their temper, as it shows a shortness of argument and facts. When they find they cannot deal successfully with our facts and arguments they call us bores and faddists. (Laughter.) We have sometimes heard of blessings in disguise: I think we may term this a compliment in disguise. (Laughter.) After all, what is a faddist? It is a person who has an idea in his head and follows it up whether it does harm or good to himself. If he is to get any good by it for himself he is not a faddist. As to being a bore, all good work is a bore to the lazy and self-indulgent; indeed, to such people both duty and conscience are a bore. Therefore I do not think we need complain of being called bores and faddists. (Hear, hear.) We hope that public opinion will continue to be heard on the side of justice for India; and I believe that in due time the House of Commons will recognise that what is now deemed to be a bore is a sacred duty that they must perform and a responsibility which must be discharged in the interests of India and of this country. (Cheers.) Gentlemen I must apologise for the length of my remarks, and I will now only ask you to drink to the health of our friend Mr. Cairns, to wish him long life, and to thank him for the valuable services he has rendered to India and to humanity. (Loud cheers.)

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI: I rise with the most cordial feeling and with the deepest appreciation of Mr. Cairns's services. I

welcome him home on my own behalf, and on behalf of all my Indian friends who are here present. (Hear, hear.) I am most heartily glad that he has been to India, and that he has seen the National Congress at its labours, and I trust he will give us a very clear and just account of what he has seen, both with regard to the constitution and the work of that assembly. I, as one of those who were present at the formation of the Congress, do not care a straw whether our objects are misrepresented or misunderstood. I said then, as I said forty years before, that my political creed was that I had the utmost confidence in the conscience of the British people. I repeat that to-day, after fifty years' experience; I have the same confidence still, and, whatever may happen, however many may be our disappointments, I still feel faith in the efforts of our friends, and I hope I shall continue to hold that faith to the end of my life. (Cheers.) It is useless for me to offer any strong remarks with regard to those who misrepresent us or misunderstand us. If there is one thing more than another of which the British people should be proud in regard to the Congress, it is the fact that the very creation and existence of the Congress are a result of British rule. (Hear.) I say that the British people should be proud of that. It means—whatever misrepresentations may be made of it—that a great force has been created, and if it is endeavoured to-morrow to suppress the Congress, it will quickly rise like a phoenix from its ashes. (Hear, hear.) I believe it will continue its work. The system of British Government has faults as well as merits, and we believe if we can point out evil defects in that system, we shall be doing useful work. Our object is to strengthen the connexion between Great Britain and India. (Hear.) At present, unfortunately, the system is directed more or less to the benefit of one party only, while the other party suffers from great destitution and poverty. I am sometimes told that I have the poverty of India on the brain. Well, it may be so, and it will remain there till the British people are aroused to a sense of their responsibility, and as long as my feeble voice can be raised, I will raise it in an attempt to make the British people understand their duty and fulfil their responsibilities. (Cheers.)

MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I am sure we are all very anxious to hear our friend Mr. Caine, and therefore I will not long detain you. I wish just to express my deep sympathy with the people of India, who are now suffering from famine and pestilence. I do not think that India possesses any truer friend than Sir William Wedderburn—(hear)—and I only wish the House of Commons would give him as good a hearing as he has had this day. Unfortunately, our experience is that the House of Commons takes little interest in discussions on Indian questions. Now, we all, I am sure, feel a very deep sense of sympathy with India in her trials. (Cheers.) Those of us who have been in India know something about the magnitude of the famine. I am afraid it will prove to be one of the most widely extended famines of the century, and the suffering will be extensive in spite of the efforts of the Indian Government, which I believe is doing all it possibly can do to relieve the distress. (Hear.) But I believe this country will not be discharging its duty to India if it does not make it a handsome Imperial grant. The Indian Government, after all, cannot undertake to do more than grant a bare subsistence. It cannot in justice to the taxpayers undertake to do more. A good deal, however, needs to be done beyond that, and I therefore hope our Government will do what I believe the nation would like it to do, and make a generous grant in aid of the sufferers in their long-continued and terrible trial, and thus strengthen the union between Great Britain and her Eastern dependency. (Hear, hear.) I only wish to say in conclusion, Sir William, how much we are indebted to you for calling us together. (Cheers.)

LORD KINNAIRD: I will only occupy one or two minutes. We in the House of Lords do not go in for long speeches, and therefore I have not got into the habit of making them. (Laughter.) First, I wish to thank Sir William Wedderburn for having invited us to this pleasant gathering, and then I wish most heartily to welcome home Mr. Caine, whose experiences in India we shall be very glad to listen to. With regard to the suggestion that a grant should be made from Imperial money in aid of the Indian Famine Fund, I must express my earnest hope that if one is made, it will be rendered perfectly clear that it is not intended to be in any way a check upon private charity. (Hear, hear.) I am afraid that people

are only just beginning to realise the vastness of the need for assistance. Our fellow-countrymen in India are wholly unable to cope unassisted with the disaster, and I hope it will be found that among all the Queen's subjects, from the highest in the land to the lowest, there will be a readiness to afford that help which is so much required. (Hear, hear.) I do not think the friends of the National Congress need be discouraged because they are meeting with some little opposition: it should spur them to greater efforts. We gladly welcome you you home again, Mr. Caine, and we hope that the work which you and others interested in India are doing will be carried forward to a successful issue. (Cheers.)

SIR WILFRID LAWSON, M.P.: I am as glad as anyone in this room, or, indeed, in the country, to see our friend Mr. Caine safe and sound back again. We are old comrades in arms. (Hear.) I remember reading an advertisement in the *Matrimonial News* once, in which a young man "tall, fair, and good-looking, is anxious to meet a young lady of the same way of thinking." (Laughter.) Well, I think you, Mr. Caine, have met that young lady of the same way of thinking. As you know pretty well what we think, I need not dilate upon it. I was much struck by the expression of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji when he said he was accused of having the poverty of India on the brain.

MR. CAINE: As I am said to have drinking on the brain. (Laughter.)

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: We know how much Mr. Naoroji has done for India, and we believe that as long as his life is spared he will continue his efforts, and will be able to do a great deal more for that Empire. May he, and may our guest, live long to fight the cause they have so much at heart, both at home and in India. (Cheers.)

MR. H. J. WILSON, M.P.: I am very glad to join my voice with those who have preceded me in most heartily welcoming Mr. Caine back to this country, and in thanking you cordially for your kindness, Sir William, in thus bringing us all here together again. (Hear.) While you may agree that speech is silver, yet, as you are all waiting to hear our guest, I am positive you will assent to this proposition that silence on my part will be absolutely golden. (Hear, and laughter.)

MR. BURT, M.P.: Having heard both the House of Lords and the House of Commons, I am sure all will agree that the sooner Mr. Caine is addressing us the better, and therefore I shall be satisfied with simply expressing my thanks to you, Sir William, for giving us this opportunity of coming together again, and testifying to our hearty sympathy with Mr. Caine in the efforts he is making for the improvement in the condition of our fellow-subjects in India. (Cheers.)

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: When just now I referred to the fact that the front Opposition bench failed to give us that support which we think we had a right to expect, I should have mentioned that there were some very pleasing exceptions, and that Mr. Burt for one has always readily supported any action the object of which is to do justice to India. (Hear, hear.)

SIR GEORGE BIRDWOOD: I am very glad indeed to assent to Sir William Wedderburn's invitation to add a word of cordial welcome to Mr. Caine personally on his return from India, and equally glad to comply with his peremptory instruction not to exceed "two minutes" in what I may say. A candid friend who happened to know that I was a Conservative in home politics described me, on my entering the room, as "a fly in a pot of ointment." (Apologetic cries of "No, no!") Yes, yes!—but even so my presence here serves, and quite agreeably to myself, to set off the exceeding preciousness of the Radical unguent in which I find myself floundering. (Loud laughter.) But it has also weightier justification. I have never identified myself with Indian politics. But all my life it has been my public duty to promote to the best of my opportunities and very humble abilities the knowledge in this country of the reproductive resources of India, and it has been the absorbing occupation of my private leisure to vindicate the title of the artistic and religious culture of the Hindus to independent development, in the direction given to it by the natural tendencies of the race, and the reaction on their inner consciousness of the position which India has occupied during the past 3,000 years in international history. I therefore flatter myself sympathise with everyone who recognises the regeneration of the people of India through their own spontaneous efforts, and, so far as possible through their own traditional institutions, and, differ as I may

from Sir William Wedderburn as to some of the means by which he seeks the common end we all have in view, I fully and respectfully recognise the high ideals by which he has ever been actuated, and his absolute disinterestedness in all he has endeavoured to do for their realisation; and he has always commanded not only my grateful, but I may add, for I have many pleasing associations with his name and family from my student days in Edinburgh, I will add therefore, my affectionate regard. I also recall with pleasure the previous occasions in which I have been permitted to share in the charm of Mr. Caine's ever genial company; and I most heartily join in the welcome accorded to him this afternoon, and pray that he may be long spared to devote the sound physical health and vigorous mental powers with which he is blest to the sympathetic and fruitful service of the people of India. (Cheers.)

Prince RANJITSINGH: It is indeed a very great pleasure to me to see such strong and influential friends of India assembled in this room, and I trust that sooner or later the whole of the people of this country will entertain towards India the feelings which actuate Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Caine, and Mr. Naoroji. (Hear.) I know you are all anxious to listen to Mr. Caine's experience, but, at the same time, may I be allowed to make a suggestion? One reason why the Indian National Congress is misrepresented is because it is generally believed to be associated with the Liberal party of this country. I trust that the people of this country will not make Indian questions party questions—(hear, hear)—and if it could be realised that there is no party aspect, I feel sure we should find among our supporters a great many Conservatives as well as Liberals. (Hear, hear.) I am especially glad to welcome Mr. Caine, because I know he has at heart another cause in which I am able to sympathise with him, and that is the cause of temperance. (Hear.) I trust he may long be spared both in health and years to do good work on behalf of the two causes, both in this country and in India. (Cheers.)

Mr. HARWOOD, M.P.: I believe I have the honour of being called upon to say a few words to you because I had the pleasure of attending the last National Congress, although I did not participate in its work. I was there simply as a student, for I wished to learn all I could as to the movement, and I was very glad indeed to meet Mr. Caine there and share in some of his experiences. We stayed together at the same house for a period of ten days, and I saw enough of him during that time to be able to say at the close that he disliked me less than he expected;—(laughter)—and I liked him a great deal more than I expected. (Renewed laughter.) As I said, I attended many of the meetings in which Mr. Caine took part, and I should like to note one fact in regard to the Congress. Its name and fame is not generally associated with the most extreme timidity and moderation;—(laughter)—but I was struck with the courageous, moderate, and critical attitude taken up by those who participated in the debates. It is not for me to say anything as to the Congress itself; I merely looked on from the outside, but of this I am convinced that it is not a movement which has for its object interference with the supremacy of England;—(hear)—on the contrary, that supremacy is fully recognised as an axiom of the whole movement. I think the Congress is a distinctly Conservative movement in the sense that its object is to conserve the position of this country in regard to India and to make that position more secure by bringing it into closer *rapprochement* with the feelings of the people of India. (Cheers.) At some of the committee meetings which I attended, that was impressed very strongly upon me. It was there stated, again and again, that the main object of the Congress was to bring the Government of the country more into touch with the feelings of the people, and, therefore, as to its being a mere party question it is so only in the sense that it is distinctly a Conservative movement. I went through the famine districts—or most of them—and the impression I gathered was that one great cause which is producing such disastrous results in our Eastern empire is the depreciation in the purchasing power of silver. This consideration I recommend to economists, because I hold that with a gold currency much might be done to relieve distress. I can only say, in conclusion, we heartily welcome Mr. Caine back, and wish him health to continue his labours in the cause of patriotism and philanthropy. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. HERBERT LAWIS, M.P.: I am glad to be able to say a few words. I am sure there is not a nationality in the world which more heartily sympathises with suffering, where-

ever it may be found, than does Wales. (Hear.) Mr. Naoroji spoke of the power of sympathy, and I venture to think that that is one of the most important and potent factors in the national life of the present day. (Hear, hear.) We have seen its power within the last few days, and I am sure that the people of Great Britain only need to be informed, as they should be, with regard to the true state of things in India, and then, certainly, there will be no lack of sympathy, material, as well as moral. (Hear, hear.) It has sometimes been suggested that India exists only for the benefit of Great Britain and of Englishmen who are sent out to take part in its administration, but I am sure the people of this country are determined that she is not to be governed merely for the sake of revenue or for the benefit of the governors. It is the action of men like Mr. Caine which inspires the feeling in India that the masses of the people there are not deserted, but that they have true friends in this country who are determined to do their best to secure justice for them. (Cheers.)

Mr. FLETCHER: I have no claim whatever to the distinction of being called upon to address this gathering, beyond the fact that during my career as a journalist I have always tried to awaken the sympathy of the English people in the cause of India. But there are journalists present who have done far greater service in that respect—men who have proved that they had India, not only on the brain, but in their hearts. I am glad to join in the welcome home to Mr. Caine, and I hope we shall soon hear of his return to the House of Commons. (Cheers.)

Mr. W. S. CAINE, who was received with cheers, said: I must, first of all, Sir William, thank your guests who are assembled here to-day for the kind and hearty manner in which they have received the toast which you proposed. I will not take up your time with elaborate thanks, and I will only say how fully I recognise the kind sympathy, and that I accept the function we have been engaged in to-day, at the invitation of Sir William Wedderburn, as an indication that, so far as the work entrusted to me in India is concerned, I have at any rate performed it to the satisfaction of my chief. (Hear, hear.) Now, while I do not wish to be led away from the subject of the meeting of the National Congress by the sympathetic remarks which have been made as to the famine in India, I should like to say how heartily I reciprocate the suggestion of my friend Mr. Samuel Smith, that a grant should be made from imperial funds so that the people of the United Kingdom may aid the people of India in their terrible distress. (Hear.) I believe that if the Government proposed that a million sterling should be voted the suggestion would meet with a hearty response from the democracy. (Cheers.) It would, at the same time be a message of sympathy which the Indian people would thoroughly appreciate, and it would do more to settle the permanence of British rule than any other step that could be taken at the present moment. (Hear, hear.) Now, I went out to India during the past winter as the representative of the British Committee to the Indian National Congress. The British Committee is held to be an integral part of the Congress and not an outside body, and it is entrusted with the function of promoting the interests of the Congress in this country, and especially in the House of Commons. As the representative of the British Committee I not only attended the Congress in that capacity but I was also elected as the representative of seventeen electoral districts in India. I did not have to select my constituency as I would have had to do in this country. I visited in addition twenty-two leading Congress circles and electoral districts, and studied with great care the methods by the procedure of which this important body is called into active existence. With the exception of my friend Mr. Hume, I am the only Englishman who has seen three Congresses. I have been at three separate ones, and therefore I may claim to speak with some authority with regard to the operation of this important body. My four visits to India—for this last was my fourth—have impressed me more and more with the vastness and intricacy of the social problems which still have to be settled there. (Hear.) After my first visit to India I returned to this country thinking I knew something of the national feeling, but since then I have found out how difficult it is for any Englishman to know very much about the social and political problems which so immensely affect the peoples who form the Indian nation. (Hear.) It is absolutely impossible for Englishmen, however able they may be as administrators, to satisfactorily settle any of these vast and

intricate problems without the aid of the Indian people themselves, and the Indian National Congress, more than any other institution in that country, is in a position to furnish that help to the Government of India by enabling them to get at the opinions of the people of India themselves. (Hear.) Unfortunately there has been a great deal of misunderstanding in the public mind as to the main objects of the Congress, and even the Secretary of State for India does not appear to have the remotest idea of its real aims. I have read with great care the speech which he made in the House of Commons in respect of the reasonable amendment proposed to the Address by our Chairman, and I think we may take that speech as a type of the vulgar estimate in which the Congress is held. For instance, look at his cheap sneer in regard to the generosity of the leaders of the Congress! It was a sneer which was prompted by pique at being driven from his absurd and optimistic position with regard to the famine. At the very time that speech was being made, however, a meeting was being held in Calcutta in aid of the fund, and the men at whom the sneer was directed were contributing largely to the Famine fund. The Maharajah of Dharbanga, one of our strongest and warmest friends, actually contributed eight lakhs of rupees, and expressed an intention of giving eight more should it be necessary to do so, besides making large remissions of rent. Others evinced an equally generous spirit, and were doing so while Lord George Hamilton was indulging in a sneer at them. I found that the men everywhere undertaking the work of raising money for famine relief in India were almost all of them members of the Indian National Congress, and that local charity and mutual self-help were doing much to mitigate the distress. Under the circumstances I think Lord George Hamilton would have been better advised if he had not given utterance to that sneer. (Hear.) In the same speech he charged the Congress with never losing an opportunity of attacking the Indian Administration and with endeavouring to diminish its influence over the people of India. This is evidently intended for a grave indictment against the Congress. But, even if that were true, it is precisely what Sir William Harcourt is doing at the present moment: for he, Lord Kimberley, Mr. Morley, and other members of Her Majesty's Opposition are engaged in never losing an opportunity of attacking the administration of the Government and endeavouring to diminish their influence over the people of this country. The Indian National Congress was once described by Lord Lansdowne as the advanced Liberal party of India. I am not prepared to accept that definition—(hear)—I prefer, instead, our Chairman's description of its object and aims. Lord George Hamilton, in the same speech, made some extraordinary statements as to the doings of the Congress. Has he read the resolutions passed by it? Has he ever read one of the published reports of the Congress meetings? Let me read you the condensed telegrams sent from Calcutta by Reuter. We are constantly being charged with being a seditious body. I rather think the resolutions prove the utter lack of foundation for any such charge—(hear, hear)—and it would therefore be well for everyone to understand in the future that in the opinion of Lord George Hamilton sedition in India simply means disagreement with the Government of India—(laughter)—everybody adverse to that Government is seditious. (Renewed laughter.) A good many people now present are consequently seditious—and, of course, there are some who are not. (Laughter.) Now, what were the resolutions passed by this seditious body? The first was one heartily congratulating the Queen-Empress on the attainment of the sixtieth year of her reign, and earnestly hoping that her Majesty may long be spared to rule. The resolution was passed unanimously, all the delegates standing. I fail to find any sedition there. (Hear, hear.) The second resolution expressed the thanks of the Congress to Sir William Wedderburn and other members of the British Committee, and accorded a hearty welcome to me, the Committee's delegate. The third resolution advocated an important reform in the shape of the separation of judicial and executive functions. That was sedition five years ago, but now the Government have promised to give effect to the reform, and thus it has come within the range of practical politics. (Hear.) The fourth resolution urged that the demands of the Imperial Government on the local governments should be limited and that the latter should spend money for the improvement of their own provinces. That is surely a very simple proposal. Then, we have a demand that immediate effect shall be given to the resolution passed by Parliament in 1893, that

Civil Service examinations should be held simultaneously in England and in India, and, further, a protest against the recent scheme of education for the Civil Service excluding Indians from the higher posts. Then, here is a most seditious resolution—it is in favor of the introduction of the system of trial by jury throughout the country. (Laughter.) Next, there is a protest against the salt duty; while the ninth and last resolution passed on that particular day is the most seditious of all, for it sent the warm congratulations of the Congress to Mr. Gladstone on completing his 87th year. On the following day the Congress protested against the disabilities imposed on Indian settlers in Africa, and appealed to the British and Indian Governments to guard their interests and relieve their disabilities. The second resolution endorsed the medical reforms advocated by Dr. Bahadurji before the Indian Expenditure Commission, at a table around which sat both Conservative and Liberal statesmen. I do not think anyone there would have charged Dr. Bahadurji with sedition simply because he suggested important reforms in the Medical Service of India. (Hear, hear.) The next one might just come within the charge of sedition, because it advocated excise reforms, a system of effective local option over liquor and drug shops, equal treatment of all sections of the people, an Arms Act, the founding of military colleges for the natives of India, the granting permission to natives to join volunteer corps, and the abolition of the compensation allowance of the Indian Council, as well as the establishment of a High Court in the Punjab. Then came the famous Famine resolution, which authorised the President to cable to the India Office and to the Lord Mayor urging the immediate opening of public subscriptions, and which seems to have been specially obnoxious to Lord George Hamilton. The first resolution carried at the final sitting of the Congress urged that the Acts of Incorporation of Indian Universities should provide that they should teach and not simply examine; the second advocated the repeal of the Coolie Emigration Act; the third urged the appointment of a third member to the Governor's Council in Madras and Bombay; the fourth demanded that the settlements of the land revenue should be guaranteed for a minimum of sixty years; the fifth declared it to be desirable that no Indian Prince should be deposed until maladministration or misconduct had been proved to the satisfaction of a public tribunal; the sixth urged the assimilation of the methods of electing the Legislative Council in the Central Provinces to those in force in Bengal, Madras, and Bombay; the seventh expressed satisfaction at the selection of Mr. Wacha, Secretary of the Congress, to give evidence before the Welby Commission; and the eighth declared full and unabated confidence in Mr. Naoroji as a representative of the people of India in the House of Commons, and expressed the hope that he would be re-elected for Finsbury. (Hear.) These are the resolutions which were passed by the Congress, the proceedings of which closed with three cheers for the Queen-Empress. What on earth is there in them that any reasonable politician can object to? They constitute fair and legitimate criticism of the Government of India, and if that Government were wise it would welcome the existence of the Congress and pay respect to its recommendations. So much for the charge that the Congress never loses an opportunity of attacking the Indian administration. There is, of course, in these words a distinct suggestion of treason and sedition which is altogether unworthy of any statesman. Lord George Hamilton, in the same speech, declared that "the Congress arrogate to themselves the representation of millions of the people of India," and added, "There never was a more preposterous claim." If I am not trespassing too far on your time and patience, I should just like to deal with that assertion, for I shall be able in a few words to show how completely justified we are in the claim that millions of the people of India were represented at the Congress. This statement again proves how little Lord George Hamilton knows about the Congress at all. I cannot give the representative character of the Congress which Mr. Harwood and I attended at Calcutta, because the figures are not yet published; so I will take the Allahabad Congress in 1893, although the statistics as to that are not exceptionally favourable. Still, it was held in the centre of the country, and it was a National Convention to which the different provinces sent delegates. Now, I find that for that Congress there were 140 electoral divisions, which returned an aggregate of 528 delegates, in addition to 97 which were representative of Allahabad city itself, thus giving us a total

of 625. Madras was the most remote province represented, but it sent for 19 districts 39 delegates, each of whom had to travel 3,200 miles at his own cost. So far as Madras was concerned, those delegates were thoroughly representative. Bengal sent 105 delegates from 30 districts. The *Glasgow Herald* referred to the Congress as the happy hunting-ground of the irresponsible Bengali babu. Undoubtedly, Allahabad was more convenient to Bengal than any other place—Calcutta excepted—and that will explain why the representation was so large. Yet I am not so sure that it was more than it ought to be. There are, be it remembered, 71 millions of people in Bengal out of a total population in British India of 221 millions, so that the province was really entitled to one-third of the representation at the Congress, although it only embraced one-sixth as a matter of fact. The remainder of the Congress included 77 delegates from 22 districts in Bombay, these delegates having had to travel 1,700 miles at their own cost; 22 from 6 districts in Berar, 40 from 13 districts in the Central Provinces, 99 from 25 districts in the North-West Provinces, 76 from 12 districts in Oudh, and 19 from 4 districts in the Punjab. The Congress was thoroughly representative. We are always being told by our opponents, as we were told by Lord George Hamilton, that the Muhammadans stand aloof from these National Congresses. Why, at the Allahabad Congress there were 89 Muhammadan delegates in the total number; the Muhammadans form one-fifth of the population of British India, and they were represented by one-seventh of the Congress, and this in a body created by popular election. I think that this in itself a complete answer to the charge that the Muhammadans stand aloof; but if further evidence were required, there is the fact that the Chairman himself was a Muhammadan. We are told that the Congress men are not representative men of India: that they represent only the vakil, the press man, and the babu; and that wherever representative institutions exist, Congress men do not come to the front. I venture to assert that in nine cases out of ten the men appointed to act on these representative institutions are adherents of the Indian National Congress; and I will point out that the representative character of the Congress delegates has got its confirmation in the recent opening of the Legislative Councils to elected representatives. And who are elected to these? Are they drawn from the India which Mr. Bhowanagsee represents, or from the India the Congress represents? Let us see. Take the constitution of the Viceroy's Council to-day. Bengal is represented by the Maharaja of Dharbanga; Madras by Ananda Charlu, the President of the Nagpur Congress; and Bombay by Mr. Sayani, the Mussulman President of the Congress to-day. Mr. Mehta, Mr. Sayani's predecessor, is also a member of the Bombay Council; while Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, another Congress president, has also been a member of the Viceroy's Council, and Mr. S. N. Bannerji, the president of the Madras Congress has been elected a member of the Bengal Council. I might go on and give other instances, but I think I have said enough to show that for such popular election as there is to these legislative councils, the people of India love to elect men who have proved their interest in their welfare by conspicuous service in the Congress movement, and have thereby gained the confidence of the population. (Hear.) We are often asked, What does the Congress represent? We do not claim that it represents those who do not approve of the movement, but we do say that it represents all educated India, and I have no hesitation in asserting that nine out of ten of the men who have matriculated at the universities there are staunch Congress men. (Cheers.) I think I have justified my contention that it is not preposterous for us to claim that the Congress represents millions of the people of India. (Hear, hear.) Then, we are told that the Congress has no claim to represent rural India, and can at best be only said to represent the urban populations. But even that justifies us in what Lord George Hamilton calls our preposterous claim to represent millions of the people of India. (Hear, hear.) Everyone with the least knowledge of India knows that these urban centres have vast influences over rural India. There are over 2,000 of them, and their inhabitants are all in touch with rural India. (Hear, hear.) There is nothing more remarkable than the recent Bombay exodus; 350,000 people have fled before the plague. Where have they gone? one and all to their native villages. Bombay is largely dependent on the mills there; people work in them six or seven years, and save enough to enable them to go back to their villages and to buy a little bit of land to cultivate, and thus

the reflex influence upon the urban from the rural population is very great and difficult to measure. Further, I have no hesitation in saying that there is a very large direct representation of the rural population in the Congress itself, and I believe that at the Allahabad Conference, no fewer than 150 of the six hundred and odd delegates might be termed landholders. I believe the figures show that 145 out of 625 were directly engaged in agriculture. This interest is certainly quite as well represented at the Congress as it is in the British House of Commons, where the agricultural labourer is only directly represented by Mr. Joseph Arch. Now, during my four winters in India I have probably been present at at least 100 meetings for the election of delegates to the Congress, and I have watched the method by which the selection is made. My own constituency is Sholapur; I attended an election there four years ago. That electoral district comprises 583,000 inhabitants; the city itself has a population of 62,000, so that the rural constituency numbers 521,000, spread over an area of 4,540 square miles and containing 716 villages. The arrangements for the election were made weeks beforehand by the local Congress centre, the villages were all communicated with, a large number were visited personally by members of the Congress Circle Committee, and speeches were made explaining the objects of the Congress and the resolutions it was proposed to submit to it. Each village was requested to appoint a delegate to take part in the final election in the Market Place at Sholapur. We saw the people come into the city; many had had to walk 30 or 40 miles; there were in all from 15,000 to 20,000 present, and they represented a population of at least 400,000. No fewer than 140 such meetings were held up and down India, and it is, of course, the only way in which these elections could be conducted. At the meeting at which I was present at Sholapur names were brought forward and discussed and the candidates were selected who were able to undertake the long journey to Calcutta—a distance of 3,000 miles. The elections are going on all over India throughout the months of October, November, and December, the Congress being held in Christmas week. That is the method by which the Congress is elected. And what is the work of that Congress? It is to discuss questions which affect the general welfare of the people of India. The proceedings are conducted entirely in English. I wonder how many people there are in this country who could discuss questions in the French language? Yet these natives of India speak English as fluently as anybody in the House of Commons, not excepting the Irishmen when they are obstructive. (Laughter.) I heard men like Mr. Ghose and Mr. Bonnerjee speak, and I have no hesitation in saying of the 625 members who took part in the Congress that they constitute a body fully equal in capacity to the House of Commons itself. (Hear.) Yet this is the body in regard to which Lord George Hamilton has indulged in these cheap and stupid sneers! And these are the men to whom he has taken so much exception! I ask you, on the contrary, to say that their influence with regard to matters affecting the welfare of the Indian people is a good one, and that the demands they make are reasonable ones and ought not to be stigmatised as either seditious or ridiculous. (Cheers.) At the National Congress I heard men asking to be allowed to have some share in the government of their own country—men who have sought to be returned to Parliament by constituencies in this country. (Hear.) There are a number of young Indians present to-day who, under the law giving lodgers' votes, are automatically placed on the registers and given power to vote for members of the British House of Commons. Yet when they return to their own country they will enjoy no such privilege in regard to the administration of Indian affairs; they will be unable to express any wish whatever, except through the Congress, with regard to the methods by which they are governed. I say not a single word in disparagement of the great Indian Civil Service, but I think we have a right to criticise its methods, and that is a work which the National Congress is fully competent to undertake. (Cheers.) I again thank you, Sir William, for your kindness in inviting so many friends to meet me here, and for the hearty welcome you have all been good enough to give me on my return home. It has been said that I went to India at great personal risk and inconvenience, but all I can say is that nothing could give me so much pleasure as to go to India again, where I have formed many friendships, and to do what I can to strengthen—so far as my limited powers go—the attachments which exist between this country and her greatest dependency. (Cheers.) In conclusion,

I wish to say I was never so much impressed as with the warmth of the affection—the passionate affection—entertained for Mr. Naoroji in India. (Hear.) From one end of the Empire to the other his name, whenever mentioned, is enthusiastically received and his popularity differs only from that of other popular men by reason of the fact that it exists among every class in India alike. (Cheers.) He is everywhere recognised as a true friend of India, and, although some may think that for fifty years he has been but as a voice crying in the wilderness, it will be found that he has accomplished a great and good work, and I trust that our dear old friend may live to see the fulfilment of his aspirations. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

Mr. NAOROJI briefly proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, and

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, in reply, said: It affords me very great pleasure to meet you all here, and I thank you for so readily coming to welcome our friend home again.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

The following information regarding the Indian Budget appeared in the newspapers of March 19th:

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram summarizing Sir James Westland's financial statement, which will be published in India to-day:

"Accounts for 1895-96 closed with a surplus of Rx.1,534,000, being Rx.563,000 better than estimated last year. Of this improvement Rx.163,000 is in railway revenue and Rx.213,000 in military expenditure.

"Main feature of the revised estimate, 1896-97, is the loss of revenue and expenditure due to famine. Expenditure on famine relief works is estimated at Rx.1,891,000 in addition to Rx.75,000 provided for in Budget on account of Bundelkhand famine in the earlier part of the year. Loss of revenue is estimated as follows:—Land revenue, Rx.2,394,000; salt, Rx.262,000; other principal heads of revenue, Rx.374,000; railway net earnings, Rx.1,234,000; total, Rx.4,264,000. Military expenditure is increased Rx.196,000 by high prices, due to scarcity. There is gain in irrigation of Rx.270,000. Total of figures directly attributable to famine and scarcity, Rx.6,081,000, of which Rx.574,000 is charged on provincial balances and Rx.5,507,000 falls on Imperial accounts. Revised estimate accordingly closes with deficit Rx.1,987,000, being Rx.2,450,000 worse than Budget, being the Rx.5,507,000 above mentioned and Rx.419,000 loss on opium account, less Rx.1,329,000 improvement in exchange due to better rates, Rx.474,000 protective railways transferred to capital account, Rx.608,000 savings in military estimates exclusive of the Rx.196,000 excess expenditure, and Rx.1,065,000 improvement under other, numerous heads. The exchange realized during the year has been 14-16d., against 13-75d. taken in Budget estimate.

"In framing the Budget estimate, 1897-98, this same rate of exchange, 14-16d., has been taken without alteration. The Budget estimates, 1897-98, work out to a deficit of Rx.2,464,000. Compared with Budget 1896-97, exchange is better by Rx.1,360,000; land revenue worse Rx.447,000, and railway earnings worse Rx.917,000—both due to famine; opium worse Rx.1,189,000, owing to low prices; military expenditure in India less by

Rx.511,000, as last year included special mobilisation expenditure; the famine relief expenditure provided for in the Budget is Rx.3,611,000.

"Total famine relief expenditure both years Rx.5,607,000, but much depends upon future prospects as to weather and crops. This is independent of about Rx.300,000 advances to rayats.

"The statement announces continuation of programme of railway expenditure. In accordance with policy explained in March last, Rx.8,758,000 have been spent in 1896-97, and Rx.10,130,000 will be spent in 1897-98, besides Rx.2,470,000 and Rx.3,284,000 spent by branch lines and other companies not under direct guarantee. This necessitates Government loan of four crores in India and £3,500,000 sterling in England, besides £1,000,000 sterling temporary debt. Drawings of the Secretary of State on India will amount to £13,000,000 sterling. The statement contains a full review of provincial finance and of the new quinquennial settlements with local governments. In conclusion it refers to the cost of famine being so much greater than the declared deficits, and bases upon this the hope that when famine and plague have passed away financial progress will be resumed."

Review.

MEDICINE IN INDIA.

A Short History of Aryan Medical Science. By H. H. SIR BHAGNAT SINGH JEE, K.C.I.E., M.D., D.C.J., LL.D., F.R.C.P.E., Thakore Sahib of Gondal. With ten plates. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.)

It is pleasant to see an Indian who has taken the highest English degrees in medicine, applying his first leisure to the patriotic task of setting forth to his English confreres an outline of the history of medicine in his own country. The pleasure is heightened into admiration when that Indian physician is also the ruler of a Native State. For the example will tend to dissipate the stupid imagination, still only too prevalent, that Native Indian princes are either devotees of Oriental pleasures or villains of melodramatic type. The Thakore Sahib of Gondal has not only been invested with the honorary degrees that are easily accessible to rank and wealth, but he has also achieved in the hard and beaten track of continuous study and serious examination the English medical degrees that testify to the best modern knowledge of the subject. With all this personal industry and acquirement, the Thakore Sahib bears a high name for enlightened rule and administration in his State of Gondal. In the present volume he takes his stand simply as medical historian, and he bears himself with the modesty of knowledge, and yet with the dignity of spokesman for a long history of medical theory and practice that has been more freely criticised than studied by the experts of the West. He dedicates his work to his old teacher and friend, Professor Sir William Turner, and thereby assures it of the fairest

consideration from the very flower of British medical competence.

By the very nature of the case, the art and science of medicine must be of incalculable antiquity in India as elsewhere. In India, however, like all other sciences, medicine has never been able to separate itself definitely from the all-embracing and overshadowing influences of religious theory and practice. Very probably the persistence of this companionship has had a great deal to do with the hasty opinions that Western science has pronounced upon Indian medical ideas in a general sense of depreciation. The apparent lack of positive and inductive procedure has suggested to pride and prejudice a short cut to an adverse, not to say a contemptuous, verdict. The Thakore Sahab has expounded the case for Aryan medicine in methodical form, if concisely; and he has patiently set forth many particulars which an English historian of the subject would, in all probability, have swept away with impatience. But this very fact adds to the value of the work. The Thakore Sahab, with the modern British science of medicine before his mind, quietly and firmly puts forward the Indian facts, however odd and preposterous on the face of them, and claims that the science as conceived and built up in India "contains a mine of information not to be altogether despised by the students of medicine of our day." "Should it be approached in a spirit of fairness and enquiry," he says, with just claim, "possibly it might disclose the germs of not a few of the marvellous discoveries in the realm of medicine of which the present century is justly proud, and afford a diligent scholar ample scope and materials for comparison between the old and the new systems, with a view to supply the deficiencies with one or the other for the benefit of mankind." The expression of claim could not be more modestly presented, yet it is patent that under the velvet touch there is a harder substance which challenges the right to be duly reckoned with. The political position of the Thakore Sahab will reinforce his professional qualifications in securing a fair hearing for a little understood science that it concerns the rulers of India to study with the frank allegiance to facts required from all sober seekers after the truth.

The Thakore Sahab, pointing to the advanced state of Aryan enlightenment, properly reminds us that much progress in civilisation implies a long and continuous development. He makes a proud claim for his ancient countrymen—a claim that deserves at least to be patiently estimated:

"The country was a cradle of learning for the whole world, and history bears witness to the fact that many a nation that now walks with its head erect would have been nowhere had it not borrowed considerably from the intellectual st rehouse of the ancient Hindus. This country was at the pinnacle of glory when other nations were either not in existence or were wallowing in crass ignorance. Most of the sciences, which the present century boasts of so much, were not unknown to the ancient Hindus; and one has but to look into their writings to see whether the truths propounded by them some thousands of years ago do not still endure in their natural freshness."

It was only the other month that we had occasion to speak a word for the Hindu attainments in Astronomy and Mathematics. Similar claims might be strongly advanced in respect of their study of

chemistry, language, music, architecture, military science, law, religion, philosophy and politics. "When the state of civilisation was so perfect, and when all sorts of useful sciences were regularly studied, there should be no wonder," as the Thakore Sahab urges, "if the science of medicine, too, received its share of attention." On the contrary, the wonder is that Western students, armed with the inductive method, should have so far forgotten it as to pass sentence on Aryan medicine without applying a deliberate and full examination of the ascertainable facts. If the Indians have never been able to extricate science from the domination of religion, neither have Europeans always been able to exclude the bias of prejudice from investigations that can be rightly conducted only in the pure light of reason. Let us make a fresh start. The controlling power of religion over Hindu medicine may be found after all to be more a matter of form than of essential restriction. In any case, the business of scientific enquiry is to get down to the real facts underlying the superficial appearances.

The Thakore Sahab passes in review the ancient writers on Hindu medicine, and outlines the Hindu theory of creation. He then expounds Hindu practice during the period of nubility, the principles of hygiene as understood by the Hindus, and next the theory of Indian medicine. On this last-mentioned subject he remarks as follows:

"The science of Aryan Medicine is, as we have seen, based on the three morbid diatheses. These dispositions are born with man—nay, it is asserted that there is no substance in the universe which does not owe its formation to the humours in more or less proportion. The humoral pathology of the ancient Aryans has been in existence for ages. Diagnosis made on the principle of this theory, and medicines administered in conformity with its teachings, have, say the Hindus, worked pretty successfully in India. This theory seems to have been borrowed from the Hindus by Hippocrates (460 B.C.), the Father of Greek Medicine, and to have retained its hold on the medical schools of Europe for more than 2,000 years. To discard this theory as thoughtless and barbarous is, urge its advocates, unjustifiable. The epithets are strongly resented by the Aryan physicians, who complain that their science has not been properly studied and examined by modern investigators, who have condemned it on insufficient data. They are, however, taking comfort in the hope that modern medical science, in the course of its onward march, or on reaching its goal of progress, may possibly land its votaries on the very theory which they have at present rejected."

The chapters on the Indian *materia medica*, on Hindu writers on aetiology, diagnosis, and treatment, and on the qualities of a physician and his prognosis, contain numerous elements of curious interest. There is even more striking matter in the narrative of the rise and fall of Indian surgery. The Thakore Sahab points out that numerous ailments that are now in Western countries treated by the knife were anciently in India cured medicinally; and he makes strong claims for the early proficiency of Indian surgeons. Thus:

"It was only in rare cases, and for effecting a speedy recovery or affording immediate relief, that they had recourse to surgical operations. And yet their earliest works mention no less than one hundred and twenty-five surgical instruments for ophthalmic, obstetric, and other operations? They were experts in forming new ears and noses . . . and our modern surgeons have been able to borrow from them (Hindus) the operation of rhinoplasty' (Weber.) On this subject Dr. Hirschberg of Berlin says: 'The whole plastic surgery in

Europe had taken its new flight when these cunning devices of Indian workmen become known to us. The transplanting of sensible skin flaps is also an entirely Indian method.' The same writer also gives credit to the Indians for discovering the art of cataract-couching, 'which was entirely unknown to the Greeks, the Egyptians, or any other nation.' The cataract operations are, it is said, performed by Indian practitioners with great success even to this day. The Hindus were also experts in performing amputations and abdominal section. . . . Inoculation for small-pox seems to have been known to them from a very early age. . . . 'The Hindu philosophers,' says Dr. Wise, 'undoubtedly deserve the credit of having, though opposed by strong prejudice, entertained sound and philosophical views respecting the uses of the dead to the living; and were the first scientific and successful cultivators of the most important and essential of all the departments of medical knowledge—practical anatomy.' . . . A certain incense should be kept burning in the operation room: this foreshadows the germ theory of the present day. . . . Brain-surgery, which is considered one of the greatest achievements of modern science, was not unknown to the Indians."

It is added that "the surgeon should not leave his patient without offering a prayer to the Almighty for his speedy recovery." The chief cause of the decline of the ancient Hindu surgery was "the aversion of the Brahmans, who had the monopoly of teaching the various sciences, to animal food and to the sacrificial offerings, which were too common in the pre-Buddhistic period." The whole volume is exceedingly able and strangely interesting, and we close it with keen appreciation of the Thakore Sahab's final word:

"Let the Western and the Eastern Schools of Medicine, then, join hands and reconcile themselves to each other whenever possible. Let them meet as friends, and not as foes or rivals. Under present circumstances, the East has much to learn from the West, but the West, too, may have something to acquire from the East if it so chooses. If the Medical Science of India, in its palmy days, has directly or indirectly assisted the early growth of the Medical Science of Europe, it is but fair that the latter should show its gratitude by rendering all possible help to the former, old as it is, and almost dying for want of nourishment. The Indian Medicine deserves preservation and investigation. It is the business of all seekers after truth—be they Europeans or Hindus—to take up the question in the spirit of fairness and sympathy. The arrival of such a spirit will, it is hoped, lead at no distant date to a juster appreciation of Aryan Medical Science."

We should add that six of the plates figure varieties of pharmaceutical apparatus, and the remaining four a selection of surgical appliances and instruments. A useful bibliography is appended, and the glossarial index is judiciously full.

AS OTHERS SEE US.

"The seventh volume of INDIA, which is published by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, contains a large amount of matter of interest and importance to all who are concerned in the right government and prosperity of the peoples of Hindustan."—*The Manchester Guardian*.

Reviewing our seventh volume (1896), the *Westminster Gazette* described it as "a well arranged file of carefully prepared articles and statistics on Indian matters which must prove of considerable value to politicians and journalists, and others. Our Eastern dependency is a topic on which there is not only much indifference but ignorance in this country. This a course of study of the columns of INDIA might do something to dissipate."

"The best source of current information on the controversies of our great dependency published in England."—*The Speaker*.

"All who are in sympathy with popular native aspirations will be delighted to see the manner in which 'the political, social and intellectual activities of the Indian movement are reflected in its pages.'—*The Leeds Mercury*.

"The volume of INDIA for 1896 has reached us, and will be found invaluable by students of Indian affairs who sympathise with the development of the native."—*The Star*.

"Brimming over with interest . . . an excellent periodical."—*The Western Mercury* (Plymouth).

"The new number of INDIA contains much instructive matter."—*The Newcastle Leader*.

"Our esteemed contemporary INDIA."—*The Englishman* (Calcutta).

"INDIA, in the hands of a new editor, seems really in a way to perform the difficult feat of making a publication entirely devoted to Indian affairs pay its way in England. Its pages may be looked to for some exposition of most subjects that are before the Indian Government and public."—*The Pioneer* (Allahabad).

"That very useful organ INDIA is doing yeoman service in England for the people of this country."—*The Champion* (Bombay).

"The current number is, like its predecessors, full of interesting reading."—*The Advocate* (Lucknow).

"INDIA is accomplishing vast good by spreading correct information and arousing slow British interest in the social and economical as well as political condition of the Indian peoples."—*The Chicago Herald*.

"An unread newspaper."—*The St. James's Gazette*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MARCH, 1897.

- BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. Broadfoot, Major J., "Kafiristan and the Kafirs."
HUMANITARIAN. Reid, Andrew, "Famines; England and India's Peril."
INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. (A. Constable and Co., 2 Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Ranade, Hon. Mr. Justice, "Social Reforms." Pope, Dr. G. U., "Leaves from an old Indian's Note Book." "The Late Mr. Manomohan Ghose."
INVESTOR'S REVIEW. "What does the Indian Famine mean?"
NINETEENTH CENTURY. Rees, J. D., "Fighting the Famine in India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MARCH, 1897.

- CROOKER, W., B.A. "The Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India." Two vols. (A. Constable and Co.) 21s. 0d.
GRAHAM, REV. J. A., M.A. "On the Threshold of Three Closed Lands." (E. and R. Clark, Edinburgh) — — —
CURZON, RIGHT HON. GEORGE N. "The Pamirs and the Source of the Oxus." (F. Stanford) 6s. 0d.
CHEVILLON, ANDRÉ "Romantic India." (Heinemann) — — —
INNES, LIEUT.-GENERAL M'LEOD. "The Sepoy Revolt." (Innes) 5s. 0d.
GOUGH, GENERAL SIR CHARLES and ARTHUR D. INNES "The Sikhs and the Sikh Wars." (A. D. Innes) 16s. 0d.

Printed by A. ROWSE, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 24 and 25, Palace Chambers, London, E.W.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 34 AND 35, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, E.C.]

VOL. VIII., No. 5.]
(NEW SERIES.)

MAY, 1897.

[Subscription, Post Free:
SIX SHILLINGS PER ANNO
IN INDIA, SIX SHILLINGS.]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indians: Notes on Indian Affairs	129	A Case for Enquiry	145
The Rayat and his Rackrent, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	135	Ruskin	146
The Health of British troops in India, by Alfred Webb..	137	Our London Letter.. .. .	148
A Famine Budget, by H. Morgan-Browne, LL.B. ..	138	British Indians in South Africa	150
A Strong-Minded Hindu, I.—by W. Martin Wood ..	140	Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence of D. E. Wacha and G. K. Gokhale	152
The Secretary of State for India	142	"Counsellors of the Empress"	158
The Congress and "The Times"	143	Review: The Story of India.. .. .	158
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects..	144		

Indiana.

We print on another page the full text of Mr. J. P. Goodridge's reply to the statement, published in the *Times*, that supporters of the Indian National Congress had not contributed to the Famine Relief Fund. Nobody who knows anything about the Indian people could charge them truthfully with lack of generosity or of neighbourliness. If there is no poor law in India, that is, as Sir William Wedderburn lately pointed out, 'because Indians help one another. A more hospitable and liberal people, up to the limit of their resources, is not to be found. But the *Times*, and some official authorities who ought to know better, have endeavoured to discredit the Congress in the eyes of the British public by accusing, first the organisation as a whole, and then the individuals who compose it, of failing to subscribe to relief operations. No accusation could be more wanton or more grotesque. It is leaders and supporters of the Congress who have been most liberal and most energetic in India, not only in raising funds, but also in organising the various local committees, whose co-operation has been of inestimable value in combating the famine. When, therefore, the *Times*, having given currency to this calumny, received a complete and authoritative contradiction, its plain duty was to give to the truth not less publicity than it had given to inaccuracy. Even so, the original offence would not have been fully repaired, as

the mischief had been done. The *Times*, however, seems to have understood differently the obligations of honour and the methods of journalism. It published only a mutilated fragment of Mr. Goodridge's letter—which, therefore, we now reproduce in full.

MR. GOODRIDGE, who lately returned to England, has discharged an important public service in India by visiting some of the famine-stricken districts and frankly criticising the methods of the authorities. It is to be hoped that he will shortly lay before the public at home the results of his investigations. These appear to have been conducted chiefly in the Central Provinces, where, as a retired civilian, Mr. Goodridge was on familiar ground. His letters to the *Pioneer*, the *Statesman*, and other journals reveal a condition of things in the Central Provinces of which official optimists like Lord George Hamilton must be completely ignorant. Mr. Goodridge has, in consequence, drawn upon himself a characteristic rebuke from some Anglo-Indian censors. They accuse him of "casting to the winds the traditions of the Service"—meaning, apparently, that when he saw culpable mismanagement and neglect of duty he ought to have held his tongue. Mr. Goodridge's rejoinder is brief and to the point:—

"I am not aware that I have in any way exceeded the bounds of fair criticism, or have been wanting in the consideration due to late colleagues. Many whom I have since met have expressed full agreement in all that I have said. If one of the traditions of that Service is that a former member

must in all cases refrain from criticising late colleagues, even in a time of famine, when he sees much going on around him to the discredit of British administration, then it must be confessed that I am prepared to cast all such traditions to the winds. But if, as I think, I had carefully abstained from taking action in order to bring the true state of things to public notice, I should have acted selfishly and cowardly, and not according to what I conceive to be the best traditions of the Service."

Mr. Goodridge's chief contentions with regard to the Central Provinces are (i) that there were frequent and sufficient warnings of the approach of famine long before it reached an acute stage; (ii) that these warnings were either not noticed or ignored; (iii) that when the wandering of emaciated persons set in, and heavy mortality had ensued, the measures adopted were inappropriate and inadequate; and (iv) that the present modes of relief are ineffective and wasteful. This is a grave and categorical indictment of the conduct of the authorities in the Central Provinces, and it is brought by an "expert" whose competence and responsibility nobody would impugn. Yet Lord George Hamilton permits himself to say that there is no evidence, official or non-official, to show that relief operations have been in any way insufficient.

"The elements of famine," said the "Caught Napping." Orissa Famine Commissioner, "are much the same everywhere. It is entire ignorance of the whole subject which produces disaster." Mr. Goodridge declares that, although the famine of Orissa and Madras were followed by full enquiries, the results of which were circulated in an easily accessible form, the same errors and omissions are nevertheless to be found in 1896 as in 1866 and in 1876. In spite of the clearest proofs of impending famine throughout the year, and the warnings of the Famine Commission, the Government of the Central Provinces had up to October, 1896, done nothing but call for reports and undertake a few insignificant measures of relief. The authorities regarded the work offered by the Saugor-Katni railway as adequate for relief purposes, but Mr. Goodridge gives a very different account of it:—

"The railway work is in the usual way given to contractors at specified rates, and they sub-let to petty contractors, who deal with the people. Task work is given and it is impossible for persons not accustomed to this particular kind of hard labour to earn more than an *anna* a day, and generally it is much less. Many complained loudly to me that at the time of payment they were given a pound of millet and told that there was no coin for payment, and that if they were not satisfied with that they could leave the work. The demand for employment being generally in excess of the supply, the villagers are entirely at the mercy of these petty contractors, and are glad if they can get a mouthful of food for their day's labour. Women and children get so many cowries for a basketful of earth removed. They all declared in the presence of the contractors that they could not earn sufficient to keep them in health, and this seems to be admitted on all hands."

As for the stereotyped official theory that the majority of the wandering skeletons and of those who die in famine houses come into British territory from adjoining native states, Mr. Goodridge says:—

"I did not find this to be correct on my visit to the Damoh Famine House. For out of a total of 888 inmates, 547 belonged to the Damoh district, 76 to other Central Province districts, 26 to the North-Western Provinces, and 211, or about one-fourth, to the adjoining Native States. In British frontier districts it is the custom to say that dacoits come from Native States (where they are harboured) and raid British territory, but when one crosses the border precisely the same complaint is made against the British police administration."

"Caught napping" is the verdict which, in Mr. Goodridge's opinion, the historian will be compelled to pass upon the Government of the Central Provinces with reference to the famine. The question at once suggests itself—will that verdict apply to the Central Provinces alone? Side by side with Mr. Goodridge's letters and articles, it is useful to read the corroborative evidence given by a correspondent "C" in the *Pioneer* of March 14th. Having dissected the official method of dealing with statistics of mortality, this writer adds a practical suggestion:—

"What this mortality really means, the extent of the desolation and ruin this famine has wrought, can only be accurately ascertained in one way, and that is by taking a census, say in January, 1898. It would be three years short of the ordinary period, but the 1901 census would not be indispensable, and the value of such a census would be far greater than the cost of carrying it out."

Perhaps somebody will ask Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons what steps it is proposed to take in order to obtain a correct estimate of the mortality due to the present famine:

QUESTIONS IN PARLIAMENT WITH REFERENCE TO FAMINE MORTALITY HAVE HITHERTO PRODUCED VERY LITTLE RESULT. Lord George Hamilton has, as a rule, been content to put off his interrogator with a promise of "further papers." But these papers, which were issued on the eve of the Easter recess, are more important for what they omit than for what they contain. Of the latter, much had already appeared in the newspapers. What had not so appeared consists chiefly of belated provincial reports. It will be necessary, therefore, to resume the cross-examination of the India Office, and in this connexion we may well reproduce the following passage from the letter signed "C," which was printed in the *Pioneer* of March 14th:—

"There has lately been published a circular—I think by the Government of India—which reveals a distinct intention of concealing the mortality from famine—a deliberate project for 'cooking' the statistics. The gist of the circular is that officers whose duty it is to report deaths from famine are not to report them as deaths from starvation unless it can be clearly established that the victims have had no food for several days. Where this proof is wanting the deaths are to be shown as deaths from privation. What the exact meaning of privation

will hereafter be defined to be is an interesting speculation. But that it will be something quite apart from starvation or famine is very clear. It is also very evident on the least consideration that, except in rare instances, it will be impossible to prove that a dead man has had no food for several days unless a *post mortem* examination is held, and in the majority of cases this would mean bringing a body some miles to the nearest dispensary where there was a qualified surgeon or physician. How often a subordinate official would be at the pains to do this when he could save himself all trouble by entering on the report this mystic term 'privation' is easily calculated by anyone who has any knowledge of the ways of subordinate police, medical or civil officers, such as head constables, assistant apothecaries, and naib tehsildars and kotwars."

Lord George Hamilton said the other day that if Mr. Leuty thought the present famine "could pass over India without raising the mortality above the level which obtains in normal times," he stood alone in that opinion. But if the injunction of this circular is carried out, there may, after all, be no deaths due to "starvation"—at any rate, in the official reports.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI has summed up the defects of the present system of Indian Race administration in India as depriving Indians of "wisdom, work, and wealth." Mr. G. K. Gokhale, the accomplished Professor of History and Political Economy in Fergusson College, Poona, dwelt upon this point emphatically and usefully in the evidence which he recently gave before Lord Welby's Commission. "The excessive costliness of the foreign agency is not," said Professor Gokhale, "its only evil. There is a moral evil which, if anything, is even greater. A kind of dwarfing or stunting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority, and the tallest of us must bend in order that the exigencies of the existing system may be satisfied. The upward impulse, if I may use such an expression, which every school-boy at Eton or Harrow may feel, that he may one day be a Gladstone, a Nelson, or a Wellington—and which may draw forth the best efforts of which he is capable—that is denied to us. The full height to which our manhood is capable of rising can never be reached by us under the present system. The moral elevation which every self-governing people feel cannot be felt by us. Our administration and military talents must gradually disappear owing to sheer disuse, till at last our lot, as hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country, is stereotyped." This is, we think, a statement of the case which should appeal strongly to the English people.

By way of illustrating "the practical monopoly of all the higher posts by Europeans" in all departments of administration, Professor Gokhale laid before Lord

Welby and his colleagues a striking analysis of the Civil List of Bombay Presidency for the present year. The table, which tells its own tale, is reproduced here:—

Covenanted Civil Servants, or, as they are now called, *Civil Servants of India*.—The total number of these Civil Servants attached to Bombay at present is 156, out of whom only five are Indians, these five having entered by the competitive door in England. There are besides, eight statutory Indian civilians. The Members of Council, the High Court Civilian Judges, the Commissioners of Divisions, the Secretaries to Government, the senior Collectors are all Europeans. There is one Native among the District and Sessions Judges, and one Acting Junior Collector among Junior Collectors.

City Magistrates.—There are four City Magistracies, two on Rx. 800 a month and two on Rx. 500 a month. The two former are held by Europeans (not Covenanted), the two latter by Natives.

Land Records and Agriculture.—There are six posts in this Department with a salary of over Rx. 400 a month. They are all held by Europeans.

Forest Department.—There are twenty-nine posts in this Department with salaries ranging between Rx. 400 a month to Rx. 1,600 a month. They are all held by Europeans. There are nine Europeans even below Rx. 400 a month.

Salt.—There are twelve posts with salaries ranging between Rx. 400 and Rx. 1,130 a month. Only one of these is held by an Indian.

Post.—The Postmaster-General is a Civilian. There are eleven posts under him with salaries above Rx. 400, out of which seven are held by Europeans.

Telegraph.—There are twelve posts in this Department with salaries ranging between 400 and 1,000 rupees, and they are all held by Europeans. There are moreover forty posts between Rx. 100 and Rx. 400 a month. Of these also thirty-six are held by Europeans.

Revenue Survey.—There are ten posts in this Department with salaries above Rx. 400. They are all held by Europeans.

Accountant-General's Department.—The Accountant-General and Deputy Accountant-General are Civilians. There are five posts under them with salaries ranging between 400 and 1,000 rupees, four of which are held by Europeans.

High Court Judges.—Out of seven Judges, two are Natives.

Government Law Officers.—There are seven Government Law Officers, of whom six are Europeans. Four of these get Rx. 2,000 and above, one gets Rx. 1,000, and the sixth man gets Rx. 250. There is only one Native among these, who is paid Rx. 300 a month.

Officers of the High Court.—There are fourteen officers with salaries ranging between 400 and 2,500 rupees a month. Of these six are Natives.

Prison Department.—The Inspector-General draws Rx. 2,000 a month and there are under him eleven officers receiving Rx. 350 to Rx. 1,200 a month. They are all Europeans.

Cantonment Magistrates.—There are eleven such magistrates with salaries ranging from Rx. 100 to Rx. 1,250 a month. They are all Europeans.

Police.—There are fifty-four officers in this Department with salaries ranging between Rx. 250 and Rx. 1,800 a month. Of these only three are Natives, and they are all drawing Rx. 250 a month. There are, moreover, five officers in charge of Railway Police. They are all Europeans and draw salaries ranging between Rx. 350 and Rx. 1,000 a month.

Education.—The Director is paid Rx. 2,500 a month, and under him there are forty-five officers receiving between Rx. 400 and Rx. 1,600 a month. Of these only ten are natives, and with one exception, they get either 400 or 500 a month—

the one gentleman mentioned as an exception is a Native Christian and draws 633 rupees a month.

Ecclesiastical.—There are thirty-one paid officers in this Department. They draw between Rx. 400 and Rx. 800 a month and are, of course, all Europeans.

Medical.—The Surgeon-General draws Rx. 2,500 a month, and there are under him fifty-nine officers drawing salaries between 400 and 1,600 rupees a month. Out of these only four are Natives.

Sanitary.—There are seven posts in this Department with salaries between Rx. 400 and Rx. 1,200 a month. They are all held by Europeans.

Political.—There are sixty-six officers in this Department, drawing salaries ranging between Rx. 400 and Rx. 3,600 a month. Only two of these are Natives, one of them drawing Rx. 400 and the other Rx. 450 only.

Public Works.—There are eighty-three officers in this Department, drawing salaries between Rx. 250 and Rx. 2,500 a month. Of these twenty-three are Natives.

The Subordinate Judgeships and Deputy Collectorships are the only branches of the public service which are free from this practical monopoly by European officers.

The Proposed MR. H. N. HARIDAS writes: "It was Court of admitted by the Secretary of State in Arbitration. his speech on the question of sending Indian Forces to the Soudan that 'from time to time charges were put upon India in excess of the interests which India has had in former expeditions; (INDIA, August, 1896, Supp. p. 60). The Indian Government have also complained from time to time that they are made to pay towards objects which have nothing to do with the interests of the country. Sometimes, as in the case of the Soudan expedition, the Indian Government contend that they should not pay at all. In other cases they contend that they should pay a part only; and in others that the part which the Indian Exchequer is asked to contribute is unduly burdensome. The decision of these various points involves the consideration of issues of great legal, constitutional and financial importance. No doubt, *bona fide* differences of opinion are likely to exist between the authorities in India and the Cabinet in England. Ministers of the day have always some Imperial policy, sound or unsound, to advance, and in their enthusiasm for that policy they cannot look at it from the standpoint of India, but are unconsciously led to impose burdens unjustly and even illegally on the revenues of India. It is, therefore, of great importance that for the adjudication of such questions there should be an independent tribunal, before which both the parties might appear. The necessity of such a tribunal was frankly admitted by Lord Salisbury. But before we pronounce on any new tribunal to be constituted for the purpose it may be interesting to examine the provisions already made by law for such contingencies. To do so we have to trace the legal relation in which the Government of India stood before 1858 to the authorities at home. The

direction and control of authorities in India were vested in the Court of Directors and the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, created by 33 Geo. III. cap. 52, sec. 2, their powers being defined by the same Act. Thus, there were two independent bodies or corporations (for the Board of Commissioners, known as the Board of Control, was nothing more than a corporation)—creatures both of statute, exercising in some cases concurrent, in others exclusive, jurisdiction. The directors were bound to carry out the orders of the Board of Commissioners, but they were not bound to carry out all. The Board of Control or the Commissioners had their jurisdiction limited by the Statute that created them. If we assume that this Board, under the influence of the Cabinet of the day, sent an order which they had no legal right to send, the Directors might either obey the order or disregard it. It is not my object to discuss what legal liabilities the East India Company would have incurred in case they obeyed the order. But this is certain, that no court of law or equity would have allowed them a shelter under the orders of the Board of Commissioners. On the other hand, if the orders were disregarded, the Board of Commissioners, if they wished their orders to be enforced, would have no other course but to proceed in the courts against the defaulting Directors (as they did by applying for a writ of *Mandamus* from the judges of the King's Bench in *R. v. East India Company*, 4 B, Act 530), or to petition the Privy Council, as the North-West Company of Canada did for the repealing of the letters patent issued to the Hudson's Bay Company (*Forsyth Const. Law*, p. 389). In either case the Directors would have been able to advance proper arguments in support of their conduct, and to obtain the judgment of a competent judicial tribunal on points in dispute between themselves and the Board of Commissioners.

Why not the Judicial Committee? "SINCE no Statute had expressly taken such cases out of the cognisance of the Superior Courts of Law,

such courts were competent, and the only competent tribunals, to decide these questions, and they did exercise their jurisdiction twice against the Court of Directors (Maxwell, p. 151-2-3). This really was the state of the law, if the Act that created the Board of Commissioners had not made some further provision for the determination of differences between the Board and the East India Company. But the Legislature of the day thought fit to give some means by which the East India Company themselves might insist if they chose upon a reference in such matters. Sec. 16 of the Act of George III. enacted, among other things, that

"... if the said Board shall send any orders or instruc-

tions to the said Court of Directors, to be by them transmitted, which in the opinion of the said Court of Directors shall relate to points *not connected with the civil or military government or revenues*, then on any such occasion it shall be lawful for the said Court of Directors to apply by petition to His Majesty in Council touching the same, and His Majesty in Council shall decide *how far the same be or be not connected with the civil or military government and revenues of the said territories and possessions in India*, which decision will be final and conclusive."

The italics are mine. Suppose that at that time the Commissioners had asked the Directors to send an Indian force to Suakin, and the Directors were of opinion that the expedition had no connexion with Indian interests, or they wished it to be established 'how far' the expedition was connected with Indian interests, they could have had the judgment of the Privy Council on those points. Now, this section, so far as reference to the Privy Council is concerned, became inoperative because the powers and duties of the Commissioners and the Directors were combined in the same official in 1858. The effect of the Act of 1858 was to make such reference difficult, as the Committee of the whole Privy Council could not be moved under this sec. 16. The only tribunal that can exercise this jurisdiction is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The repeal of sec. 16 of 33 Geo. III., c. 52, does not affect in the least the power of the sovereign and the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee over such questions conferred upon them by 3 and 4 Will. IV., c. 41, sec. 4. The Judicial Committee is not an unfit body for the determination of questions relating to the action of executive bodies. Only recently it pronounced its judgment on an action of the Cape Government, declaring a certain proclamation issued by the High Commissioner to be *ultra vires*. It has pronounced on a reference from the Queen—obviously under sec. 4—its judgment on a petition upon the action of the Government of Nova Scotia. It will be clear, therefore, that the suggestion advanced by Sir W. Wedderburn in his article on this subject was quite consistent with old traditions and old statutes. We have a tribunal created by the law which has been admitted to be efficient for the purpose we have in view. Our only difficulty is to approach the tribunal. If Lord Salisbury is sincere, and I am sure he is, in his desire to have questions of apportionment, etc., adjudicated upon fairly and impartially, he has only to lay down rules by which reference should be made to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council under sec. 4 of the Privy Council Act of 1833. The making of such rules requires no new legislation, and no recommendation from any Royal Commission."

The Detective as Judge. Mr. PICKERSGILL (who, if rumour may be trusted, narrowly escaped appointment as a metropolitan magistrate) called Lord George Hamilton's attention in the

House of Commons on April 19th to the union of judicial and executive duties in the same officers in India. The precise form in which Mr. Pickersgill raised the subject is, perhaps, open to some criticism, and Lord George Hamilton was able to give an evasive and useless answer. The system by which the detective becomes also the public prosecutor and the judge is no new thing in India. But it is none the more palatable on that account. Lord George Hamilton said that in his judgment the existing law required no alteration. That is, on the face of it, a contradiction of what he said in the Indian Budget debate last year—namely, that the Government of India was working in the direction of the proposed separation. Or does Lord George mean that judicial and executive duties can be separated in India without the aid of legislation? Perhaps he will explain the point in his reply to the deputation of jurists and others who are shortly to wait upon him in order to present a memorial praying for the reform of the existing system. One thing is certain. No reform will be satisfactory to public opinion in India, or in this country, which does not draw a clear line between judicial duties on one side and executive duties on the other. *

Sketches of Indian Warfare. THE little volume, "Incidents in India and Memories of the Mutiny," edited by Mr. F. W. Pitt (London :

Kegan Paul) appears to be a somewhat injudicious outcome of hero-worship. The author looks up to General W. R. E. Alexander, late commander of the 1st Bengal Cavalry, as a hero. But he seems to be innocent of warlike experience, as well as of literary capacity. One would stretch a good few points, however, in favour of a writer who could furnish additional details of any portion of the drama of the Mutiny. But it is difficult to glean anything fresh or definite from these pages. At page 80 our hopelessness was relieved for a moment by the statement that "Captain Alexander and his fellow-fugitives know a phase of the Mutiny that yet requires its historian," but only for a moment. Why, in the name of common sense, does not Mr. Pitt constitute himself that historian? What is his book for else? To be sure, he informs us that Captain Alexander went here and went there, and some trifling incidents are mentioned—among which, of course, we do not include the distressful tragedy of relatives in the country. Probably the biggest thing in the way of active service mentioned by Mr. Pitt is a reconnaissance of the enemy by Captain Alexander with five-and-twenty men five-and-twenty miles out, "after consultation by the officers of the regiment," but pending—and, as it turned out, in opposition to—the judgment of the general officer in command, Sir T. Seaton, who was then some distance off. The

movement was successful, and the enemy was dispersed. But obviously it was a most risky experiment. Be that as it may, Mr. Pitt speaks exultingly of the return of "the conquering hero," and remarks, apparently by way of complaint, that "for this service Captain Alexander received neither reward nor thanks from the Government." To our judgment, nothing could well be more preposterous; and we are not inclined to look so complacently as Mr. Pitt does upon the next day's receipt of Sir T. Seaton's belated direction that "on no account was the offensive to be taken with so small a force." We do not think with him that "complete victory justified the action." Apart from military judgment and sense of proportion, however, it is most tantalising to find such looseness of dates and inattention to detail. "Mrs. Alexander went to Agra"; we thought she was in Agra at the moment. "About the end of October Captain Alexander was directed to raise some mounted men for duty in the Agra district"—"Alexander's Horse," in fact—which he did. Next sentence we learn that "they joined Sir Colin Campbell's force at Futtehghurh, and remained several days, but, Etawah being threatened, they were ordered off there post-haste," and so on for pages without a definite date. But the junction with Campbell at Futtehghurh could not have taken place except between January 3 and February 1, at any rate more than two months after the direction to raise the force. When Lieut. Alexander, the captain's only brother, was killed at Allahabad, Mr. Pitt says he "rode alone, and rode to his death." Why not set down the precise fact that *three* of his men followed him? It would not detract in the slightest from "Paddy's" gallantry. We know he would have ridden alone, but then he didn't, and history does not permit the embellishment of romance. In the first sentence of chap. x., and again in the last sentence of chap. xiii., we learn that Major Alexander was appointed commandant of the famous Bengal Cavalry regiment, originally known as "Skinner's Horse." The whole of the intervening narrative consists of scrambling notes of the fortunes of Skinner's Horse under the original Skinner and his brother; there is not a syllable more about Major Alexander. We are not surprised to hear of "Colonel" Skinner half-a-dozen years before it is related that "for these services Major Skinner was promoted to the rank of lieutenant-colonel." In 1876 Colonel Alexander retired from active service with the rank of Major-General, and for many years he and Mrs. Alexander have devotedly busied themselves in ways of Christian benevolence at Burgess Hill, in Sussex. There can be no question but that General Alexander has had experiences which would amplify usefully the known facts of the Mutiny period, and that he played his

part with ability and honour. Unhappily, this scrappy, inexact and ineffective narrative fails to produce such an impression as we cannot but think would be produced by a sufficient and satisfactory sketch. It reminds us, both as to Mr. Pitt's performance and as to his representation of General Alexander, of Edmond About's young officer, who "n'a pas perdu son temps en voyage—il a ramassé des coquilles." We cannot accept it as worthy of the general, nor yet as possessing more than a slight minimum of historical value.

The Eastern
Himalayan
Mission.

UNDER the title "On the Threshold of Three Closed Lands: The Guild Outpost in the Eastern Himalayas" (Edinburgh: R. and R. Clark. London: A. and C. Black), the Rev. J. A. Graham has written an unpretentious and solid little sketch of missionary work. The three closed lands—lands closed to missionary activity—are Nepal, Tibet, and Bhutan. In the wedge between the three, at Kalimpong, a Mission Guild in connexion with the Church of Scotland was established in 1870. The first baptism took place in 1874. Now there are 2,396 native Christians in 40 congregations, and 2,406 scholars in 81 schools, guided by a staff of 11 European missionaries (four of them ladies), 30 catechists, and 96 teachers. Sir Charles Elliott has good ground, then, for stating, in the introduction which he contributes to Mr. Graham's little volume, that the missionaries here "have been unusually successful in converting the simple tribes from their animistic or Buddhistic beliefs to the Christian faith." Sir Charles has been there several times, and has made himself intimately acquainted with the work done and doing. Besides the church and the school operations, there is a hospital under a medical man, which contributes its share of Christian persuasion. The affairs of the church of Kalimpong are managed by its own panchayat in the spirit of self-government; the branches established in the various villages are almost, if not altogether, self-supporting; and the missionaries are keen to proselytise. Thus the church possesses what Sir Charles Elliott calls "three distinctive notes of true Christianity." The description of the place and the folk and the missionary operations is most interesting, and Sir Charles Elliott testifies to the "complete candour" of Mr. Graham's account of the quality of the Christians: "there are men and women of all sorts," says Sir Charles, according with Mr. Graham—"some weak and doubtful, some of distinguished purity of life and character." We should not have believed that there was any wheat if we had not heard of the admixture of tares. It is stony soil nough up there, but the plants seem to have taken fairly firm root.

THE RAYAT AND HIS RACK-RENT.

By Sir W. WINDHAM, BART., M.P.

There is an irreconcilable difference of opinion regarding the condition of the Indian rayat. Lord George Hamilton and Sir H. Fowler describe him as a fat and prosperous person, very lightly taxed, pleasantly conscious of "the infinite benefits of British rule." On the other hand I assert, and Indian public opinion is with me on this point, that he is a wretched starveling, "ruined, despairing, embittered," crushed by burdens too heavy for him to bear, and paralysed in his industry by the operation of laws altogether unsuited to his condition. Here is a clear and simple issue of fact. Why should this issue not be tried? I have challenged enquiry by moving an Amendment on the Address, the most public and formal way in which such a challenge can be conveyed; but enquiry has been refused. Lord George Hamilton does not find the season convenient. As regards the famine he is too busy dealing with the symptom to make a diagnosis of the disease; not realizing that this is the method of the quack rather than of the physician. I must therefore wait, and continue placing the facts and figures before the public. Perhaps when a few hundred thousands, or millions, of these fat and prosperous people have died from starvation, the House of Commons may be willing to spare a few minutes to reconsider its decision that no enquiry is necessary.

What I asked for by my amendment was, not a roving Commission, but a careful local enquiry in two or three typical villages of each Province, in order to ascertain the real facts regarding the rayat's economic condition. I took my illustration from the work of the bacteriologist, and pointed out that the individual rayat must be put under the microscope, in order to detect the microbes which blight his industry, and I indicated the nature of the mischievous organisms to be sought for. In the March number of INDIA I brought some light to bear on the microbe which has its nidus in the harsh and unsuitable system of collecting the land revenue. This month I will deal with the land revenue itself, the microbe of rack-rent, which is the originating cause of the rayat's woes; and I will show (1) that the instructions of the Secretary of State limiting the amount of the Government demand are entirely disregarded in practice, and (2) that by arbitrary enhancements of rent the rayat's improvements have been confiscated, and he is compelled to make up the Government demand by stinting himself and his family in food, and by borrowing from the money-lender. For proof of these statements I will now refer to official documents.

The principle which was to govern land assess-

ments was first distinctly formulated in an elaborate despatch from the Court of Directors dated 17th December 1856. It was then declared that

"the right of Government is not a rent which consists of all the surplus produce after paying the cost of cultivation, and the profits of agricultural stock, but a land revenue only, which ought, if possible, to be so lightly assessed as to leave a surplus or rent to the occupier, whether he, in fact, let the land to others or retain it in his own hands."

The Government claim was in fact to be not a rent but a tax upon rent. In 1864 Sir Charles Wood reaffirmed this principle, and went beyond the Court of Directors by fixing 50 per cent. of the net produce as the amount ordinarily claimable on account of the Government demand. Now, these assurances of 1856 and 1864 have never been withdrawn by any Competent Authority. They constitute, in fact, the Magna Charta of the peasant cultivator; and the friends of the rayat should never cease to appeal to them, and to claim that either the principle therein laid down should be effectually carried out in practice, or else that some more suitable method should be adopted, based upon ascertained facts and according with the customs and wishes of the people. If the rayat, after paying the assessment, were left with the wages of labour, the profit of his stock and improvements, and one half of the true rent, he would have nothing more to ask for. And we may safely say that if, like the Irish tenant, he were able to enforce this limitation by suit in the Civil Courts, there would exist no Agrarian question as between the Government and the rayat; and the foundation would be laid for a contented and prosperous body of peasant proprietors. But unfortunately the principle laid down in these declarations has not been carried out in practice; the application having been left to the judgment or caprice of the Settlement Departments in India, a special agency the reputation, and even existence of which depends upon its success in expanding the Government revenue. Hence the rates levied usually absorb, not the half, but the whole of the rental, besides eating into the profits of capital and the wages of labour. The shearer of the Indian sheep, disregarding his master's orders, not only takes the whole of the fleece, but allows his shears to bite deep into the skin and into the flesh.

That this is admitted will be seen from a very important document which forms Appendix I of the report of the Famine Commissioners; a document which may well be studied by those who desire to understand the causes which render the rayat powerless to withstand even the first attacks of famine. The appendix referred to reproduces, under the modest title of "Notes on Indian Land Revenue," a group of Minutes recorded in 1875 by the highest authorities at the India Office; the general question being, What is the nature and limit of the Govern-

ment demand under a rayatwari settlement? and, Under what circumstances may an enhancement be equitably claimed? The discussion originated with the proposal of Lord Hobart, the Governor of Madras, to stop absolutely the enhancement operations of the Settlement Department, "which with more propriety might be called the Unsettlement Department." He wisely deprecated the disturbance, loss, and vexation, involved in the periodical re-assessment of every field of a vast peasant proprietary, and with all the earnestness of strong conviction advocated a statesmanlike policy giving to the cultivators the full enjoyment of their improvements, and securing their lasting attachment to the British Government. It is upon these proposals that we find recorded a valuable Minute of Sir Louis Mallet, Permanent Under Secretary of State, followed by Sir George Campbell, Sir Henry Maine, Sir H. Montgomery, Sir Erskine Perry, and Sir Bartle Frere, the debate being closed by Lord Salisbury, then Secretary of State for India.

There is not here space to give even the substance of these Minutes. But it may be noted that no one among the writers even pretended to think that under existing arrangements one-half the net produce is really left with the rayat. It was in fact admitted that Sir C. Wood's rule had become "a mere paper instruction." But I will quote the words of Sir Bartle Frere, himself a Revenue officer, as to what the Settlement Departments really have done and are doing in India. His opinion was that throughout India the State demand rarely, if ever, fulfilled the requirements of the India Office instruction, or could be rightly described as limited to a fixed share of the true rent:

"The reader," he says, "of much of the literature relating to Indian land revenue would suppose that it came for the most part, or at least very frequently, under this class as a true land tax. But with the exception of a very few localities, almost infinitesimally small in proportion to the total area which pays land revenue in India, such a true land tax is practically unknown."

In the opinion therefore of so experienced an administrator as Sir Bartle Frere, compliance, in this vital matter, with the instructions of the Secretary of State was "practically unknown." Dealing with the Bombay Presidency, of which he had been Governor, Sir B. Frere describes the assessment as coming for the most part under the three following economic classes: (a) *a land tax fixed more or less arbitrarily*, and absorbing a varying proportion of the true rent; (b) *a full rent*, leaving nothing to the cultivator but the wages of his labour and the interest on his capital; and (c) *a rent and something more*, trenching on the wages of labour or the profits of capital. With reference to this last class he observes:

"It might seem almost impossible that the Government

demand should now amount to what is defined as class (c), rent and something more, but in my early years, when assessments were high and prices low, I often met with whole districts in the Dekkhan where the cultivator could not pay the Government demand without trenching on his own wages as labourer, to the extent of his having less for himself than a hired labourer would require."

To Sir Bartle Frere's three classes Sir Louis Mallet adds another, for he says:

"I am also informed that in many cases lands have been assessed which barely pay the cost of cultivation and yield no rent at all."

This may be called class (d) *where the land yields no rent at all*, and the assessment is taken wholly from that portion of the crop which represents the wages of labour. And to these four classes I must regretfully add yet a fifth and still more grievous case, class (e) *where the total crop is insufficient to pay the cost of cultivation*, and where the assessment must be paid out of wages earned elsewhere or from cash obtained from the money-lender. That this class (e) not only exists, but that it embraces the vast majority of holdings in the Dekkhan, will be clear to anyone who will take the trouble to study the bulky and doleful literature which has accumulated round the case of the distressed rayat: the report with appendices of the Dekkhan Riots Commission; the report of the Famine Commissioners, with the evidence taken before them; and the enquiries and debates in connection with the Dekkhan Agriculturists Relief Act. Here facts and statistics will be found in abundance, showing that the pauperism of the ordinary rayat is an increasing evil; that it is a necessary consequence of his present economic position, and that it primarily arises from the absolute insufficiency of the total produce of the land to maintain the existing population and to meet the demands of a costly European administration. Instead of improving, matters are steadily getting worse; for the fertility of the land is becoming exhausted; the population to be supported is increasing; while the demands of the Government are constantly enhanced.

To illustrate the process which is going on I will give the exact figures with regard to a couple of typical villages, the detailed condition of which was investigated by a judicial officer under my own personal observation. The first is the village of Nepti—a village containing a fair amount of irrigated land and favourably situated on a road near the town of Ahmednagar. As regards each holding the inquiry ascertained in detail the amount of the assessment, the cash expenses of cultivation, and the cost of family maintenance, together with the value of the produce and the amount of income derived by the occupant from other sources. And from the totals it appeared that the gross produce of the whole village was worth Rs. 12,001, and the income

from other sources was Rs. 3,731, giving a total income of Rs. 15,732. On the other hand, bare family maintenance amounted to Rs. 11,345, the cash expenses of cultivation to Rs. 3,007, and the assessment to Rs. 2,392, giving a total of Rs. 16,744 as the outgoings of the village. In ordinary years, therefore, the income was insufficient to meet the expenditure. And there was besides a total debt on the village of Rs. 33,132, which represented a further annual charge for interest of Rs. 7 or 8,000, and indicated a steady progress towards absolute ruin. In villages where there is little or no irrigation the case is still worse. Thus in the neighbouring village of Ohás the total crop was found to be worth Rs. 7,939; whereas the cost of cultivation, including maintenance, amounted to Rs. 12,136. Here the assessment could not have been paid at all had it not been for the considerable sum of Rs. 4,619 earned by labour apart from agriculture; by carrying grass and firewood, by working on the roads, by cart-hire, and by other miscellaneous employments rendered possible by the vicinity of a large town. Such supplementary means of livelihood are, of course, wanting in secluded villages far away from any large market or centre of industry. It may be noted that about the same time Mr. Irwin, in his book "The Garden of India" made similar calculations for one or two typical villages in Oudh, with similar result; and he gives it as his opinion that the only way the peasant makes both ends meet is by stinting himself in food and eating less than is necessary for health. And the conclusion is that by reason of exhausted soil, increasing population, and excessive revenue demands a condition of things has, in a large portion of India, been produced a full degree lower than that described by Sir Bartle Frere as existing in his early days.

Now I would ask any sane person, Is a peasantry so situated in a condition to invite large and wholesale enhancements of the revenue demand? One would have thought not, but that is not the wisdom with which we are governed. In all the recent revisions the fiscal screw is being vigorously applied by the revenue authorities:

"Half-ignorant, they turned an easy wheel,
That set sharp racks at work to pinch and peel."

One or two specimens must suffice here by way of illustration. In the Assam Valley districts the authorities managed to create serious agrarian disturbances by a general enhancement amounting to 53 per cent. In deference apparently to the disturbances the enhancement was reduced to 32 per cent. In the Bombay Presidency there existed a Standing Rule of the Department that enhancements should not exceed 33 per cent. upon a whole Taluka, 66 per cent. on any one village, and 100 per cent. upon any individual holding. Surely such a

scale of increased rent should content the greediest landlord. But not so the Government. Not long ago in the House of Commons I questioned Sir H. Fowler regarding the case of the Kolaba District, where the increase on the whole Panvel Taluka was 44.8 per cent, in certain villages over 100 per cent., and in certain individual holdings over 1,000 per cent. He had to admit the correctness of the figures, but upheld these rack-rents. If redress cannot be got in such cases, what hope is there for others?

I have stated a few grim facts, which cannot be denied; and again I ask for enquiry. Such an investigation as I have described at Nepti and Ohás need not take away a single man from famine duty; and the cost would be quite trifling: indeed experienced retired officials could be found to do such work out of mere charity and pity. But the high authorities to whom we appeal scorn such humble methods: they will not wash in Jordan, and be clean. They prefer heroic methods, and their idea of heroism seems to be noisy self-praise, contempt for the opinion of others, and resentment of outside criticism. In my humble opinion there would be more heroism in regret for past failures, anxiety to learn, and patient research into the causes which are bringing sorrow and death into the homes of the poor.

THE HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA.

By ALFRED WREB.

It must be evident to all that a supreme effort is now being made in military and medical circles to bring about the re-establishment, in India at least, of the hateful C. D. Acts. On all hands we find the "rawhead and bloody bones" being paraded of the advances of a loathsome disease amongst British troops, and the nation is being adjured to set at naught the "canting hysterics of old maids," and to be guided by the advice of men of the world. Professor Stuart, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., the author of "The Soldier and his Masters," and others have effectually dealt with the broad aspects of this question. There is one certain effect upon quiet people at home that the urgings of the friends of the Acts is certain to have, which has not perhaps by the friends of the Acts been sufficiently considered.

Whatever is the cause, whatever is to be the cure, we are appalled by the facts of the case. One writer has gone so far as to inform us that in one distant cantonment in India where none of the cares of medical supervision were available, practically all the men, in the course of a year, contracted the disease.

Every effort has of late years been made to elevate the Service, and attract young men of good character into the army. All who enter must take their chance of service in India. If the modes of life of the soldier there are such, if the temptations there are so great, that the contracting of a disease resulting from vice is not to be considered any blemish on the character, surely there is not a father or mother, a sister or brother, that would not rather see a beloved relative beneath the sod than exposed to such chances of moral contamination! The advocates of the necessity of these Acts are striking the most serious blows ever aimed at the character of the British army. The doctrine and the experiences upon which civil life is carried on are that every young man has it in his power, aided by the grace of God, to keep himself pure as his female relatives and friends. No one who has any regard for his self-respect, for his virtue (which is above all material considerations), should enter the army if the chances are vastly against his there conserving his purity. If the descent of young soldiers into vice in India is so likely that provision must be made for it, and the way made easier and pleasanter, we have no right to maintain a British army there at all. The effect upon the soldiers themselves may be bad enough, the reflex effect upon this country worse still. If it is the fact that few of the many thousand soldiers who annually return after Indian service return free from the contamination of disease, or if free, so not through abstention from vice, but through vice being rendered physically harmless—no girl, however humble, should consider her future happiness safe in wedding a soldier who has served in India. Habit in vice is everything. The system of the C. D. Acts must stand or fall together in India and at home. The tendency of such regulations undoubtedly is to increase the practice of vice. If habits fostered in India establish their raging mastery over young men, what is likely to be the result upon their return home, where none of the "protecting safeguards" are to be found?

The more the subject is considered the more clearly will it be recognized, that the slightest approach towards "regulation" tends down a path ending in a quagmire of unutterable horrors. Surely the evidence laid before us through the devotion of Mrs. Andrews and Dr. Kate Bushnell must not be allowed lightly to pass from our minds. Surely that brought forward in the enquiry which preceded the abolition of the Acts still stands. "Give a free hand to India" on this question, and we shall soon again have "Christian" Colonels sending forward precepts to have supplies of sufficiently handsome girls in readiness at next cantonment. If a "free hand" is given it will not be to "India," whose "heathen" conscience is higher on

this subject than that of too many professing Christians, but to a section of a military class, fallen out of touch with the standards of morality inculcated in the homes of England, Ireland and Scotland—standards enjoined by Christ, and which everyday experience proves possible of adherence to by men of all dispositions, under all circumstances, in every quarter of the globe.

A FAMINE BUDGET.

By H. MORGAN-BROWNE, LL.B.

Nowhere is the evidence of the severity of the present famine stronger than in the figures disclosed by Sir James Westland when making his financial statement in the Viceroy's Council on March 19th last. Taking the figures in the Revised Estimate for 1896-97 and the Budget Estimate for the current year together, the present estimated cost of the famine amounts to nearly Rs. 10,000,000. Of this, more than half represents money spent in relief, and the rest, remissions—or are they only suspensions?—of land revenue, loss on railway receipts and other indirect charges which are due to the prevailing distress. These eloquent figures attest not only the gravity of the present crisis, but the real, if somewhat tardy, awakening of the Government to the needs of the situation. Let us hope that this gigantic sum expended in relief—Rs. 5,607,000, according to Sir James Westland—is both necessary and adequate. Three important considerations belong to this question. Have the Government of India by their failure to recognise in its early stages the magnitude of the existing evil, increased the cost of those remedial measures which the Imperial Government, in opposition to the strong representations of the local Governments, seemed reluctant to take before their hands were forced by public opinion in India and in this country? Have they, after this first delay, in their efforts to make up for precious time that had been lost, still further increased, without corresponding gain to those afflicted, the heavy burdens already reposing on the impoverished Indian taxpayer? And, finally, have they, in an untimely spirit of economy, not only increased expenditure, but shown themselves niggard, and therefore tortious, trustees of that "sacred trust," the Famine Insurance Fund or Grant, which they obtained from the people for this very purpose? These are questions which can only be fully answered when the time for "reporting" on the famine has come. Whatever else they may do or not do, the Government of India will "report" to admiration. It is well in the meantime that these three salient points should be kept in view.

We must never forget that, while the need of the sufferers in the famine districts is dire and instant, the need of the general population in good years, as in bad years, though not so great, is yet great and

constant. Second only to the misfeasance of a faculty, or parsimonious, or dilatory organization for relief, would be that of hasty, ill-considered and extravagant squandering of the general taxpayers' exiguous resources. Further, there is a real danger that the undoubted financial strain of a great famine may serve to conceal the normal condition of Indian Finance. That normal condition during the last decade has been one of progressive taxation, of enhanced assessment of the land revenue, and of chronic increase of civil and military expenditure. While, therefore, making every allowance for the present pressing financial difficulties of the Indian Government, and while hoping that those difficulties are being met in a manner at once humanely adequate and financially economical, it behoves us to examine the figures of the Indian Finance Minister as carefully as though no legitimate reason for increased expenditure and yawning deficits existed.

In concluding his review of the financial situation, Sir James Westland referred to the fact that the cost of the famine was so much greater than the declared deficits, and upon this based the hope that when famine and plague have passed away, financial progress will be resumed. We propose to test this assertion of real underlying financial progress, by the facts and figures at our command. It should be observed, however, that the mere fact that but for the famine there would be surpluses is not of itself a sufficient indication of financial progress. It would undoubtedly be evidence—and most gratifying evidence so far as the Treasury is concerned—of an improvement in Indian Finance *qua* finance. But between that kind of "improvement" which is so pleasing to Indian Finance Ministers, and that substantial amelioration of the financial burden of government to the Indian taxpayer, there is a wide gulf fixed. A surplus which is brought about by additional taxation can only be styled an "improvement" by ignoring the point of view of the taxpayer. And no credit rightly attaches to the Government for a sudden decrease in expenditure which is brought about by a convenient but uncontrollable rise in the rate of Exchange between England and India. Loss by Exchange has been the burden of every Indian financial statement these many years; the *χρῆς* has been clear and strong. Gain by Exchange has been the feature of the last two budgets; but the *ἀντιχρῆς* seems somehow scarcely audible and singularly weak. Truly, Indian Finance Ministers are an ungrateful race! When, putting aside the cost of the famine, we find the taxes imposed to meet the loss by Exchange repealed to meet the gain by Exchange, and financial equilibrium supervening—then, but not till then, shall we deem it time to congratulate the Government of India on their good fortune or their economical administration, or both.

Let us turn to the figures. First of all, let us see what was the financial position in 1894-5, the year when the average rate of exchange was the lowest on record. The following figures—except where it is expressly stated to the contrary—are the gross figures, taken from the ordinary statement of the accounts of the Government of India, published in India and laid before the British Parliament.

FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. ACCOUNTS, 1894-5.

(i) Revenue.

Land, Opium, and Tax Revenue	Rx. 63,585,000
Other Receipts	Rx. 31,602,900
Total	Rx. 95,187,000

(ii) Expenditure.

In India	Rx. 63,775,000
In England	£18,707,000
Exchange:—	Rx.
On Remittances ..	13,068,000
Exchange Com- pensation, and Sterling Pay of Troops ..	1,944,000
Total	Rx. 15,012,000
Surplus	Rx. 94,494,000
Surplus	Rx. 693,000

Compare with this, the financial position as revealed in the Budget Estimate for the year 1896-7:—

FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. BUDGET ESTIMATE, 1896-7.

(i) Revenue.

Land, Opium, and Tax Revenue	Rx. 65,214,000
Other Receipts	Rx. 32,407,000
Total	Rx. 97,621,000

(ii) Expenditure.

In India	Rx. 67,530,000
In England	£15,909,000
Exchange:—	Rx.
On Remittances ..	11,860,000
Exchange Com- pensation, and Sterling Pay of Troops ..	1,859,000
Total	Rx. 13,719,000
Surplus	Rx. 97,158,000
Surplus	Rx. 463,000

Now, the difference between these two years, which was not due to expansion of the revenue or to economies effected in the expenditure, was as follows:—

Increased Customs Duties	Rx. 1,000,000
Decreased Cost of Exchange—	Rx.
On Remittances ..	1,208,000
Exchange, Compen- sation, etc. ..	85,000
	1,293,000

Unearned Financial Improvement Rx. 2,293,000

There were, of course, numerous other differences: growth of revenue, of railway receipts, etc., and a

very large increase of expenditure in India (exclusive of exchange), which very nearly absorbed the whole of what we have called the Unearned Financial Improvement. But the Revised Estimates for 1896-7 are far better for the Treasury than the Budget Estimates given above, as there was a further clear gain of Rx. 1,329,000 upon exchange. So that for the Revised Estimate of 1896-7, the Unearned Financial Improvement amounts to no less than Rx. 3,622,000 [*i.e.*, Rx. 2,293,000 + Rx. 1,329,000], to which a rising exchange contributed no less than Rx. 2,624,000. Again, for the Budget of 1897-8 the unearned improvement compared with the accounts for 1894-5 is still more, as exchange for 1897-8 is estimated to be better by Rx. 1,360,000 over the Budget Estimate for 1896-7. Thus for 1897-8 we get an unearned improvement of Rx. 3,653,000 [*i.e.*, Rx. 2,293,000 + Rx. 1,360,000]. Altogether, then, in these two years the Indian Treasury, by no effort of its own—save that of imposing new taxation—has had Rx. 7,275,000 additional resources, compared with 1894-5, with which to meet the strain of the present visitation. This calculation, it must be repeated, takes no account whatever of the ordinary growth of the Revenue, of increased receipts from the commercial services, of the savings on the debt services, or of any economies, which may have been made, or which ought to have been made, with taxation at the high level it has now attained.

Now we can better estimate what solid ground exists for the Government of India's self-congratulation. Sir James Westland states the account thus:—

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN ACCOUNT WITH THE FAMINE.

FOR THE TWO YEARS 1896-7 AND 1897-8.

To Loss of Revenue	Rx. 4,115,000
Expenditure on Famine Relief ..	Rx. 5,607,000

Total Cost of Famine ..	Rx. 9,722,000
Portion of Cost of Famine met out of Ordinary Resources ..	Rx. 5,271,000

Deficits (2 years)	Rx. 4,451,000
--------------------------	---------------

But this statement needs correction on the face of it. Even in 1894-5 there was an expenditure of some Rx. 600,000 on famine relief and insurance—which is doubtless suspended, or rather included in the total of Rx. 5,607,000 given above. This makes the *extra* expenditure on famine relief due to the famine about Rx. 4,400,000, and the account should be stated in this way:—

Loss of Revenue	Rx. 4,115,000
Famine Relief	Rx. 5,607,000
Deduct Insurance Suspended	1,200,000
	<u>4,407,000</u>

Total Extra Cost of Famine ..	Rx. 8,522,000
Portion of Cost of Famine met out of Ordinary Resources ..	Rx. 4,071,000

Deficits (2 years)	Rx. 4,451,000
--------------------------	---------------

Now we will state the account as it presents itself to us, following to its conclusion the line of argument we have taken above:—

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN ACCOUNT WITH THE FAMINE.

FOR THE TWO YEARS 1896-7 AND 1897-8.

Total Extra Cost of Famine ..	Rx. 8,522,000
Total Unearned Financial Improvement, as shown above ..	<u>7,275,000</u>

Excess Cost of Famine, or Legitimate Deficits (2 years) ..	Rx. 1,247,000
--	---------------

We see, then, that with ordinary prudence the deficiency of Rx. 4,451,000 in the two years need not have exceeded Rx. 1,247,000. By ordinary prudence we mean this: When expenditure had reached the high level of 1894-5, after a rise of unprecedented rapidity during ten years, with taxation at its admitted limit, and with exchange a constant source of financial anxiety, it would have been only ordinary prudence to have confined the increase of expenditure to the natural increase of the revenues, and to have kept the unearned improvement in the finances for the purpose of reducing taxation at the earliest opportunity, or of meeting some such calamity as that which has now befallen the country. Had this course been pursued, the present heavy deficits would have been less by Rx. 3,200,000 at least. It is conceivable that by heroic measures—such as one does not expect from the Government of India—the whole cost of the Famine to the present time might have been met without deficits; but we do not expect too much, and we will content ourselves with pointing out what might have been the financial position to-day, had the dictates of ordinary prudence been followed.

A STRONG-MINDED HINDU.—I.

By W. MARTIN WOOD.

Vishvanath Narayan Mandlik, C.S.I., born in 1833, died in 1889, familiarly spoken of in Bombay as "the Rao Sahib," occupied a conspicuous place in the public affairs of Western India during the three decades sixty, seventy, and eighty. And now a substantial service has been rendered by his (adopted) son, Mr. Narayan V. Mandlik, B.A., in publishing a copious collection of his father's "Writings and Speeches," with a "Sketch of his Life," by Mr. Dunadur Ganesh Padhye, M.A. The character and attainments of this typical Mahratta Brahmin are well summed up by his biographer thus:—

"This eminent man, whose career we have traced from his birth in a small village in the Kankar to his rise to the highest position a native can rise to—the position of a learned man, a successful member of his profession, an author of great eminence, and a politician whom the people trusted and the Government called to counsel and showed unmistakable signs of respect and esteem for."

Vishvanath was a native of Marudra, in the Bt-nageri district of the Southern Konkan. His ancestors were connected by marriage with the

Peishwas of the Deccan, who, with most of his counsellors and commanders, the consolidators of the Marhatta empire founded by Sivaji, came from the same rugged and picturesque sea-coast territory. His grandfather, Dundopunt, was a *Sabha* (provincial governor) under Baji Rao, the last of the Peishwas. To that ancestor Vishvanath owed his early training in the Hindu cult. At ten he went to the Anglo-Vernacular School at Ratnagari, where he acquired his first knowledge of English and the rudiments of Western education. At fourteen, in spite of difficulties, but encouraged by his schoolmaster, Ramchundar—a man who left his mark in the locality—the stripling made his way to Bombay, where he entered the Elphinstone Institute. There he soon secured a Clare scholarship and other prizes, enabling him to prolong his student course. That institute was then (1848-50) in its prime, under the energetic influence of its professors, Harkness, Green and Patton, the memory of whom is still gratefully cherished in Western India as the energetic pioneers there of collegiate education. Vishvanath's facility in mathematics was such that he was entrusted with charge of the classes during the professor's absence. Having completed his course, and passed the highest examinations then existing, he was strongly advised by Professor Patton to come over here and enter the competition for the India Civil Service, then newly opened to all citizens of the British Empire. As may be supposed, this was quite out of the question, for no proposal to cross the *Kala-pani* (black water) could be listened to for a moment by the young student's orthodox Hindu relatives. Even when he shortly afterwards received an offer of official employment in Sindh, it was with much difficulty that his friends consented to his leaving for what was to them, at that period, "a distant unknown land"; but they gave way. This proved the true starting-point in Vishvanath's public career; and in the circumstances of this transfer to Sindh may be traced the earlier strands of that affinity of sterling qualities in his own character with that strict uprightness and sense of public duty which were exemplified in the European officers his superiors. It was the late General Sir Le Grand Jacob, then Political Resident at Hyderabad in Sindh, who had asked the principal of the Elphinstone Institute to send him a youth as personal assistant. That eminent political officer, as the biographer remarks, "took a liking to his young and able assistant, and his interest in him never slackened while life lasted." Long after General Jacob's retirement the present writer used to hear Vishvanath speak with the highest respect of his early exemplar and steadfast friend, and quote from his letters to him on public affairs. Later on the young assistant, who rapidly acquired the language of the province, was brought into contact at Karachi with the then Mr. Bartle Frere, as also with his coadjutor, the late Hon. James Gibbs, with whom also Vishvanath subsequently worked in Bombay, in the delicate and arduous service of organising James Wilson's first income-tax, then a fiscal novelty in India. Both these eminent Civiljans recognised the valuable qualities of their energetic Hindu subordinate, who retained their confidence and friendship

throughout life; though, at a later period, Vishvanath's steady advocacy of the claims of his own class, the Khote landholders of Ratnagari, used to try severely Sir Bartle Frere in his character as one of the founders and eager vindicators of the Bombay Land Revenue Survey system. In the meantime the young official had passed through the duties of Subordinate Judge, Educational Inspector, and Curator of the Government Book Department; and in connection with these semi-scholastic appointments he did much service in editing and revising some of the school books of the period.

In 1862, being then nearly thirty, Vishvanath saw that, as administrative arrangements then stood, there was little prospect of further advancement in Government service; his energy and instinct of public capacity were strong within him; so he resolved to strike out a new course for himself. He soon passed the High Court pleaders' examination, and in 1863 began to practise on the Appellate side of the Court, which had then recently superseded the old *Sadar Adawlut*. At that time very few of the Indian advocates knew English, in which the new pleader was skilled; while, on the other hand, very few of the English judges were really versed in Indian civil law. Hence his progress was both rapid and secure. As his biographer justly remarks, "few could equal his industry, zeal, and argumentative power, and fewer still his punctilious punctuality and fearless advocacy." His independence, also, in dealing with suitors, his clients, was none the less marked; "touts" could do nothing with him, as "he cared less for money than for professional honour and his high ideal of duty and punctuality." It is mentioned as an illustration of the latter quality that on one occasion, having been unexpectedly detained in the Court at Bombay when he was due to defend a case in the Sessions Court at Poona, he chartered a special train, and duly arrived at the time appointed for him to appear. Also, in one of the Khote cases heard at Ratnagari, he had been outrun by the Government pleader; but on that occasion he chartered a special steamer in time to meet his appointment.

During the course of this part of his career he became the champion of his colleagues the Indian advocates; and to his exertions was mainly due the passing of the Legal Practitioners Act, which admitted native advocates to plead before the Original side of the High Court. In 1873 there was an opportunity for his being appointed to an acting Judgeship of the High Court; but what was regarded by the authorities as his too pronounced independence of character and his activity in public affairs were sufficient to account for his being passed over in favour of less demonstrative lawyers. He could scarcely have regretted this exemption from judicial office, seeing that he was thereby left free to devote his energies to the civic, literary, and political duties that claimed his earnest attention, more and more, as his character matured and his knowledge of public life extended. In this latter direction he gained much facility through what was only an incidental public service, the establishment, in 1864, of an Anglo-Marathi journal, the *Native Opinion*, which, though his name was not attached to it, was

known to the official, as well as the popular community as "the Rao Sahib's paper." In its tone and trenchant treatment of current questions it well represented the virile character of himself and his race; and, though many competitors have since entered the field, the journal faithfully maintains the traditions of its founder.

Our review of Vishvanath's middle and later career as an author and "man of affairs" may be conveniently entered on by reference to his notable and very concise work, "Adoption v. Annexation; with Remarks on the Mysore Question," published in England, as well as in Bombay, in 1866. It was suitably dedicated to Sir George Clerk, whom the Rao Sahib had known as twice Governor of Bombay, whose name will live in history as one of the best of the old Company's men. Sir George Clerk, step by step, manfully resisted the revolutionary policy of annexation; and he was Lord Canning's chief counsellor in finally reversing that baneful policy after the political deluge that had strewed the empire with its wrecks. The Rao Sahib's essay took the form of a thorough refutation of the Duke of Argyll's and Sir Charles Jackson's pleas for the *Balhouse régime*; and, as it combines with its masterly political arguments an exposition of Hindu law relating to adoption and "lapse," it will always remain one of the text-books of that fundamental Indian question. It is reproduced in the present memorial volume. Its concluding sentence runs thus:—

"For the British nation to permit mere land-hunger to turn itself from the scrupulous observance of treaties is a descent from the spiritual to the material—a lapse from monotheism to idolatry which must, in time, corrupt the governors and the governed, to the certain ruin both of India and England."

When this was written the fate of Mysore was hanging in the balance, which happily turned the right way, with the best results to Mysore and for England's reputation.

(To be continued.)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.

One often wonders what the intelligent foreigner must think of the selection which this great Empire makes of the men who are to rule over it, and, if the foreigner is puzzled to know why certain men are chosen for high office, still more must the natives of distant colonies and dependencies search in vain for some acceptable reason for the choice of the men whom, apparently, the nation delights to honour. The people of India, after something like two years' experience, are no doubt looking curiously for the qualities which have placed Lord George Hamilton in the highest office, controlling the destinies of millions of his fellow-subjects. They are secret and hidden, and will never be discovered by the plain man who connects talents with power and looks for some proof of statesmanship in the men who obtain the highest prizes in the ranks of statesmen. The truth is that Lord George belongs to one of those "reigning families" whose hereditary right to the comfortable

and profitable posts in the service of the Crown seems to be more safely established than even the hereditary monarchy itself. The Hamiltons have sat very near to the fount of honour and public emoluments almost from the beginning of English history. Whenever there has been anything to give away, they were always close at hand. They have no record throughout all the centuries of any great act of statesmanship or any great service to the State, but a steady stream of titles and honour, lands and profitable posts has flowed upon them from public sources. Lord George is one of the younger sons of the Irish branch of the family, who have been known for centuries in Ireland as "the hungry Hamiltons." Not that they ever suffered the actual physical hunger which has been the inheritance of so large a proportion of the Irish race, but because, although they seemed always to have the first choice in whatever there was to be given away, they were always ready for more. The estates which maintained them were all gifts from the Crown, the property of dispossessed Irishmen or disendowed churches. The fortunes of the family were founded by a judicious change of allegiance at a critical moment in the history of Scotland, and at all the troublesome changes in English and Irish history the Hamiltons have come out on the winning side. Thus it happens that Lord George's elder brother, the present Duke of Abercorn, who is the head of the family, is one of the only two peers who enjoy independent peerages in the three kingdoms. It was the father, the late Duke, who received the highest honour possible for a subject in the form of a dukedom, for no apparent reason. It was characteristic of the family genius that they were the largest beneficiaries under the Irish Land Purchase Acts of ten years ago, which were never meant for them at all. Tired of the Irish land question, the British Parliament opened the purse-strings, and granted £5,000,000 to enable the poor cottier tenants to buy out their equally poor landlords. It was thought that the money would all go to the small men on the barren lands, but some five or six of the biggest and most prosperous landlords managed to divide about a million between them. Of course, the Duke of Abercorn was one, and, equally of course, he obtained the lion's share, no less than £250,000 going into the Hamilton pockets. There must be some reason for this phenomenal success.

Lord George is a tall good-looking man of gentle manners and refined appearance—now fifty years of age but looking less. His distinguishing characteristics are a soft voice and delicate hands. His political career is an epitome of that of his family. Scarcely was he of age when he not only entered Parliament, but entered it for one of the safest seats in the country, one of the gifts usually reserved for service-worn veterans. And now, without the worry of the recurring election contest which troubles most politicians, and the adverse chances of which drive them from public life—without a thought of elections or electors—Lord George is established in Parliament for life. Without having displayed any striking public ability, the moment his party came into power he stepped over the heads of all his fellows into office as Under Secretary for India. This post he held

from 1874 to 1879, and on the first opportunity he secured promotion to the more independent and more lucrative post of Minister of Education. His party was driven from power, but on its return in 1885 he stepped up again into one of the great prizes, at the head of a "spending department," as First Lord of the Admiralty, and held the post as long as his party held office, until 1892. Now when the Tories have returned once more he is established in one of the most honourable and most lucrative posts as Secretary of State for India. It cannot be said that in any office he has distinguished himself. No great deed, no brilliant effort of statesmanship, no strenuous labour for reform has marked his career. The personal charm, the soft yielding to permanent officials and colleagues, the skill in discovering just how little worry and endeavour will carry on the ordinary work of a department on the old lines, have always made his path easy and comfortable. This has been, and will undoubtedly be, his career at the India Office—a gentle turning away from all difficulties, and an unerring instinct for the action and policy which will least disturb the thoughts or comfort of the Secretary of State and secure the peaceful enjoyment of not unrewarded position with the smallest possible effort. That is the Hamilton tradition, which strews the path of a Hamilton with roses and has done so for centuries. Remarkable charm of manner, coupled with a keen eye for substantial advantage, has made Lord George one of the most successful men of his merits in both public and private life. He is the husband of one of the most beautiful and charming wives that move in London society, and he has secured a Cabinet pension of £2,000 a year. A few pensions are provided for ex-Cabinet ministers who, having passed their lives in the service of the State, are in necessitous circumstances. Lord George is certainly the youngest, and probably the least necessitous, who ever claimed the pension. But he had no difficulty in making the necessary declaration, and so, if he never does another stroke of work for the public, he is quartered on the public purse to the tune of £2,000 a year for the rest of his days.

In the face of these private personal qualities, it is not necessary to pursue the useless task of looking for anything worth recording in his public life and deeds. The *Daily News*, commenting a few days ago on Lord Salisbury's absence from England, said truly enough that if Lord George Hamilton took a trip to Iceland nobody would be the wiser. The apparent blunder in tactics of his revolt from his colleagues on the famous debate in 1895 on the Indian cotton duties was one of the most striking incidents in his public life. But it paved the way for his promotion to his present office; and however much he was at variance with his colleagues in the House of Commons, he was acting in accord with the wishes and instructions of Lord Salisbury, and Lord Salisbury is the man who appoints Secretaries of State. The Hamilton instinct never fails. It must have been disagreeable to play a leading part in that discreditable intrigue, but he obtained his office, and a cynic might say that perhaps—in view of what he went through to serve his chief—for once he earned it.

THE CONGRESS AND THE "TIMES".

PROTEST BY MR. J. P. GOODRIDGE.

The following letter was addressed to the Editor of the *Times* by Mr. J. P. Goodridge (formerly a member of the Indian Civil Service, now a member of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress), in reply to a false statement telegraphed from Calcutta and printed in the *Times*. The letter was dated Jubbulpore, February 11th. As the *Times* omitted some of the most material portions of it, we reproduce the letter here in full:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'TIMES'."

"Your Calcutta correspondent telegraphed to you on the 6th ult. as follows:

"'With regard to the recent action of the National Congress which amounts to a condemnation of the Government famine policy, it should be noted that the leaders of the agitation have not so far raised or subscribed a single rupee to any fund for the relief of their distressed fellow-countrymen. Their sympathy has only been shown by the passing of Resolutions and the spending of money in telegrams to England. If the National Congress were a real power its leaders would be able to raise an enormous sum, but its organisation is merely one for political agitation with which the bulk of the people are out of touch.'"

"As this statement is false both in fact and in the insinuation which it conveys, I beg that you will, out of fairness to the Indian National Congress, permit me to say in your columns that all the delegates from the Jubbulpore division of the Central Provinces, where famine exists in its most acute form, had, before the date of the telegram, contributed, not once, but on several occasions, to famine funds raised at Jubbulpore and other places in the Central Provinces. I myself contributed towards the maintenance of famine houses in no fewer than three districts, Jubbulpore, Sangor, and Damoh, and during a period extending as far back as June, 1895, when, even then, there were unmistakable signs of starvation. And if it will be of any interest to your correspondent or to any else I will add that the aggregate sum of my subscriptions amounted to over Rs. 400. I am now on a tour in the famine-stricken districts of the Central Provinces, affording what aid and relief I can, both in money and by personal exertions to the starving, and am therefore unable to communicate with other delegates (in time to reply by this mail) as to whether they have also subscribed to famine funds, but this I can say without further reference, that Mr. W. S. Osine had long before the Congress meeting subscribed to the Balaghat famine fund. Now, sir, I beg to protest against this mode of warfare. Your correspondent may surely be expected to take some pains to collect and verify the news he sends home. The *Times* is not understood to be a party newspaper, and, though it may perhaps be impossible to find a correspondent who has not his own views on most subjects of public interest, and who will not colour his telegrams accordingly, yet I think that all fair-minded persons will say that your correspondent strikes below the belt when he telegraphs as fact matters of which he could not possibly have obtained trustworthy information without enquiry, and in a manner, too, which did not admit of his being promptly contradicted if his statement was incorrect,

and before it had served the purpose intended by its dispatch. The telegram was sent in support of the policy of the Government of India, and in order that no famine fund should be opened as urged by the National Congress, and this end was to be attained by showing that the telegram sent to the Secretary of State by the Congress was worthless as proceeding from a body of men who were not themselves prepared to subscribe a single rupee to a famine fund. Telegrams are not wired back to India, so that those who knew that the statement was false and conveyed a wrong impression had no opportunity of contradicting it till the mischief had been done. It is with weapons of falsehood and misrepresentation like this that this National movement is being combated. The columns of the Anglo-Indian press teem with charges of every sort of moral obliquity brought against those who take an active part in the National Congress, or even express sympathy with it. This literature is, of course, specially prepared for those who, while knowing but little of the movement are yet prepared to resist to the last gasp all reforms in the government of this country. No one here thinks it worth while to take any notice of such misrepresentations. But I think, as a delegate of the Central Provinces, and also as a member of the British Committee of the National Indian Congress, I ought not to permit this false and misleading statement, made by a responsible person such as your correspondent, to pass unnoticed. I beg, too, Sir, that you will permit me on this occasion to observe that Lord George Hamilton was ill-advised by the India Office when he adopted so uncompromising an attitude to the national movement as to say in a recent debate in the House of Commons that the National Congress is always ready to attack British rule. This must have been said in forgetfulness of Lord Lansdowne's expression of opinion to the effect that the National Congress is a constitutional movement of reform, representing what in Europe would be called the extreme Liberal party (I am quoting away from books, and cannot give the precise words used). At the last Congress I had the opportunity of meeting hundreds of educated Indians from all parts of the country, and what struck me most forcibly was the extraordinary loyalty to the Crown and hearty appreciation of British rule manifested by all I spoke with. I am, therefore, able to give Lord George Hamilton's statement a complete denial. Whatever may be said of the leaders of the Congress movement, they are almost to a man well-educated persons. They know better than any Englishman can know that their interests are better secured under British rule than could possibly be the case under any other form of government. This national movement, at its commencement, was ridiculed and declared to be merely a debating society of schoolboys, and as not to be treated seriously. Afterwards, when many of the leading men of the Congress were also to be found in the council-chamber of the Government of India, in the local councils, sitting on the bench, leaders of the bar, influential merchants and princes, this line of attack was changed, and the Congress is now pelted with all the opprobrious epithets that official spite can invent. It has been termed 'veiled sedition.' If

ever a charge was falsely brought against a patriotic and honourable body of men, it is this. Many of them have served their Queen and country with honour and distinction, and now enjoy a pension from Government, but still devote their money and energies to the cause of their country in the way they think she may best be served. I have lived amongst these people for more than a quarter of a century, and I say this, that her Majesty has no more loyal subjects than her Indian subjects. If Lord George Hamilton or any other fair-minded person will read the proceedings of the Congress, he will see that British rule is not attacked, but, on the contrary, is heartily appreciated, and is regarded as affording the sole hope of this country ever being raised up from its present state of degradation and poverty. The Congress is the exponent of the educated and public-spirited portion of the people of India. It does not attack British rule, but, in a moderate and constitutional manner, places before the rulers of this country the views which it holds on various important topics—principally fiscal and administrative reforms—with which the people are so greatly concerned. If the educated classes of India—the most characteristic creation of British rule—ever forget their mother and become disloyal (which God forbid), England will have to thank politicians like Lord George Hamilton and those who inspire these thoughtless and unwise utterances.

"Yours faithfully,

"J. P. GOODRIDGE,

"Late Indian Civil Service.

"Jubbulpore, 11th February, 1897."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1897.

- CHURCH MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCER. Fane, Rev. J. B., and others, "Special Missions in India."
- INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. (A. Constable and Co., 2 Whitehall Gardens, S.W.) Elliott, Sir Chas., "Famine Relief in India." Imad-Ud-Doulah, Nawab, "Social Intercourse in India."
- MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE. Trevor, Col., "The Famine in India."
- MADRAS REVIEW. Banton, Capt. A., "India's Military Frontier." Vaithianadham, N., "The Place of English Education in India." Natasen, G. A., "Intellectual Life in Modern India."
- NEW CENTURY REVIEW. "X," "The Indian Famine." Carpenter, Edward, "India, the Wisdom-Land" (Poem).
- NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Arnold, Sir Edwin, "The Famine in India."
- POSITIVIST REVIEW. Beesly, Edward S., "The Indian Famine."
- PROGRESSIVE REVIEW. "The Famine-Makers in India."
- TO-MORROW. Bhowaggre, M.M., "The Indian Famine."
- WESTMINSTER REVIEW. Keene, H. G., "India: John Bull's Eastern Estate."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1897.

- THORBURN, B. S. (Bengal Civil Service)....."His Majesty's Greatest Subject." (Constable)... 3s. 6d.
- The India List and India Office List for 1897. (Harrison and Sons)..... 10s. 6d.
- BURGESS, JAS....."Archaeological Survey of Western India." Vol. VI. (William Griggs and Sons)net 20s. 6d.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of *INDIA* cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of *INDIA*, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to *INDIA* (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with *INDIA*, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of *INDIA*, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of *INDIA* can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of *INDIA*, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MAY, 1897.

A CASE FOR ENQUIRY.

FOR the moment the Indian famine has ceased to occupy public attention and to fill the columns of the daily papers to the extent which is due to its importance. The rapid development of events in Greece and the Balkan Peninsula has filled Europe with the apprehension of a war into which the Great Powers may possibly be drawn, and vivid personal anxiety has for the time being left no place for sympathy. Unfortunately, it cannot be affirmed with any appearance of truth that interest in the Eastern Question has blunted the sensibility of the Indians to their own terrible sufferings. Though we might venture to predict that the famine reached its highest point last month, still there are few signs of any great or immediate decline in its severity. Purely temporary causes have from time to time contributed to effect a diminution of the numbers on relief in various districts, but the net result of these fluctuations is only a very slight improvement. The high-water mark was apparently reached in the second week in March, when 3½ millions were on relief. Statistics a week later showed a decrease of a hundred thousand, due chiefly to the withdrawal of hands for the collection of the harvest in the North-West Provinces, and to

the reduction of the famine wage in the same district in consequence of the earlier rates of grain. A still further improvement appeared a week later, the celebration of the Holi festival coinciding with more extensive harvesting; but the firmness of grain rates indicated that the decline in numbers on relief was not alone an altogether reliable test of the actual state of affairs. Consequently, one is not surprised to find that the second week in April, while showing an improvement of more than a quarter of a million as compared with the maximum a month earlier, is rather worse than the week preceding; and the further deterioration which appears in the statistics of April 22nd, largely absorbs the previous gain, and again brings up the famine roll to very little short of three millions. The reports of the spring harvest afford little ground for sanguine hopes of the future. Rajputana alone has produced a good crop, most other districts are reported fair, or fair to good, while Central India, Bundelkhand, and Gwalior are bad, and prices, on the whole, are stationary. The ebb has probably begun, but its progress is, and must be for a considerable time to come, very slow.

Details of the measures taken by the Government to combat the famine may be obtained at the cost of great pains from the two voluminous Blue-books, the second of which appeared after lengthy delay and innumerable promises just before the Easter recess. It is to this volume that the Secretary of State for India has repeatedly referred his importunate questioners in the House of Commons, and under the circumstances it was not unnatural to anticipate that it might prove interesting to students of Indian problems, even though it was a Blue-book published by the India Office. But the reader must frankly confess a sense of disappointment. Nobody will deny that in this volume of 230 pages the Indian Government has fully maintained its reputation for the capacity to present a certain amount of information in a hopelessly indigestible form, but the previous Blue-book on the famine was alone sufficient to establish that reputation beyond all fear of cavil. As an answer, however, to the enquiries made in the House of Commons, these "Further Papers regarding the Famine and Relief Operations in India" are practically useless. They merely carry out the official policy of evasion, which the delay in their publication was doubtless intended to subserve. Analysed, they consist of seven pages of telegrams, most of which have already appeared in the newspapers, the last being dated March 15th, and about 220 pages of hopelessly belated dispatches and reports. To the questions which have been repeatedly pressed in the House of Commons with reference to mortality due to the famine; questions to evade which the Secretary of State has repeatedly

given promises of information in "further papers," there is really no answer. In Burma, we are told, "no deaths have taken place directly or indirectly "due to starvation." In the North-West Provinces a few cases are admitted, and some others regarded as "possibly due to starvation." It is also allowed that the high mortality in Jhansi "possibly indicates "a reduced vitality and lower standard of living." When the official reports are compared with the accounts of unprejudiced witnesses on the spot, the conclusion is forced upon non-official minds that there is, on the part of the Government, a persistent attempt to ignore or to gloss over awkward facts. It is impossible to conceive what end can be served by the obstinate concealment or official denial of the worst aspects of the calamity. The course pursued by the Government can only be due to the ostrich-like belief of bureaucrats in their own infallibility and their wilful deafness to outside suggestions.

This "irreconcilable difference of opinion regarding "the condition of the Indian rayat"—to quote Sir William Wedderburn's words in another column—is a question of fact which calls for enquiry. It is not enough to apply mere temporary palliatives. The root of the disease must be sought and destroyed. What is the Mansion House Fund, the paltry half million which is arousing jubilation in journals like the *Times*, compared with the millions which are spent annually on military objects in which India has not a vestige of interest, or exported, in the form of pensions, home charges and the rest, to England? As well might one apply salve to a sore while the patient was bleeding to death from a wound. Sir William Wedderburn follows up his investigation of the mode of collecting the land revenue with an examination of the land revenue itself, and, by an analysis of official documents, some of them even drawn up under his own observation, he reaches some notable conclusions. The Court of Directors laid down the rule in 1856 that the right of Government should be merely a tax on rent, and the limit was further defined in 1864 as fifty per cent. of the net produce. But even this very moderate ideal has never been carried out, except in very few localities. The Settlement Department depends for its very existence on its power of expanding the revenue, and the natural result, steady enhancement of assessment, followed. By successive stages the land tax has been a tax on rent, a full rent, and a rent plus something more. All three stages are co-existent in India to-day, but the first has come near to being a mere survival of better days. What the "something more" is, Sir William Wedderburn points out by reference to definite cases and incontrovertible statistics. It is in many cases a tax on the wages of labour where the land really yields no rent; in the extreme case where the land does not even repay the

cost of cultivation it is a tax on wages raised by other means; very often on money obtained from the money-lender in the hope of more prosperous times. The rayat reduced to absolute starvation by the supersession of the general order and exorbitant enhancement has not even the right of appeal to a civil court. And when his friends in Parliament make enquiry concerning the injustice of which he is the victim a despotic bureau merely vouchsafes the reply that it has pleased the wisdom of the Secretary of State to set aside the Standing Rule, and that no interference is proposed. The enquiry suggested by Sir William Wedderburn's amendment is plainly one which is urgently needed, and that, too, while the disease is still in full activity. Justice and common sense alike forbid that it should be postponed to a period when a temporary amelioration of the condition of the rayat may induce forgetfulness of the underlying canker of which the existing misery is only a symptom aggravated by fortuitous circumstances.

RUSKIN.¹

"UNTIL either philosophers obtain the kingly "power, or those who are now called kings and potentates become imbued with an adequate measure of "genuine philosophy, there will be no deliverance "for cities, nor, I believe, for the human race." The words are the words of Plato, idealist, visionary, unpractical Plato, ringing out their oracular message across the centuries; but they might well be the words of our living prophet, uttered with not less earnestness but with a more hopeless sadness from his retreat at Coniston. The cry for "one still strong "man in a blatant land—one who can rule and dare "not lie," has been wrung from many strenuous souls, who feel that, in spite of the multitude of counsellors, the people are perishing for lack of guidance. On Carlyle's lips it took the form of many an angry paradox, as when he cried out upon the blindness of our forefathers in leaving Robert Burns to be ale-gauger at Dundee, instead of committing to him the destinies of the empire. When Mr. Ruskin speaks it is generally in softer tones; as when, in "Sesame "and Lilies," he contrasts the power of those who "do and teach" and of those who "undo and "consume," whose power, at the fullest, is only the power of the moth and the rust. "Suppose kings "should ever arise who at last gathered and brought "forth treasures of Wisdom for their people!"

But the likeness between Plato and Ruskin does not end with this demand, so strange to the practical man, that philosophy, wisdom, ideas, should bear rule in the State. It has many other aspects, and

¹*Fora Clavigera*. Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of Great Britain. By John Ruskin, LL.D. New Edition, in four vols. (London: George Allen.)

extends even to Plato's dislike for those who set a price upon that which is above price, and accept pay for the teaching of wisdom. "All good judging" and all good preaching," says Mr. Ruskin in "Fors," "must be given gratis. The professional sale of justice and mercy is a deadly sin. A man may sell the work of his hands, but not his equity nor his piety." Their humour is another point of resemblance—that humour which, playing upon the most serious themes, relieves the else intolerable tension, and for which their reward is this, that the unsympathetic reader supposes them to be flippant. And in one respect, at least, the literary careers of the two men have been singularly alike. In both the artistic instinct was originally supreme and gave way gradually to an overmastering earnestness. The critical historian of Greek literature admires the brilliance of Plato's earlier dialogues and the constructive imagination of the "Republic," and speaks disparagingly of the "Laws" as a monument of declining power. So the critic of English literature will bestow his applause on "Modern Painters" and dismiss "Fors" with a depreciatory sentence. But the cause of the change in both cases has probably been the same—no decline of artistic power, only an earnestness that deepened with years and prompted to an act of self-sacrifice, the greatness of which is quite beyond the understanding of common men. Plato's famous quarrel with the poets, as Mr. Gilbert Murray has pointed out in a suggestive passage in his new book on Greek literature, was no quarrel with bad poets merely, as we have often tried to persuade ourselves, or with a low ideal of poetry. It was a breaking with poetry altogether, and on the part of one to whom poetry was more precious than to most. There lies the pathos of it. Poetry, it seemed to him, the poetry that he loved, stood in the way of the search after truth; and poetry must go. Was not this the resolve that definitely shaped itself in Ruskin's mind, as he found that the world approved his style, treasured the rare editions of his early works, learnt by heart his "purple patches," and then went its way regardless of his teaching? Among the present writer's most cherished remembrances of his Oxford days is the hearing of Mr. Ruskin's lectures on "The Art of England." At the close of one of these Mr. Ruskin showed his delighted audience a recent drawing of his own "to prove that there was skill in the old hand yet." There are many passages, both in those lectures and in "Fors" and in "Praeterita," which show that "there was skill in the old hand yet," had he still had the heart to employ it. We shall come nearer to the understanding of Ruskin's life and writings—how sadly he has been misjudged by some of the best of his contemporaries, let the epithet, "feverish," applied to him by Matthew Arnold, bear

witness—if we keep in mind this likeness to Plato. And when we read again Plato's pathetic description of the philosopher—himself surely—who "has seen the madness of the many, how that there is no one who ever acts honestly in the administration of States, nor any helper who defends the cause of the just, by whose aid he may be saved," and who retires from public life "under the shelter of a wall, in the storm of dust and sleet which the driving wind hurries along," we may find a new application for it in our own age and country.

And all the time the disheartened man of letters had "builded better than he knew." As Plato saw his disciples carrying off some fragment of his teaching, some dialectic subtlety or other, and following it out to the exclusion of the rest, or even perverting it to some dishonest end, so Ruskin must have watched with pain those who made of the insight into painting and architecture which they owed to him only a means of heightening their selfish æsthetic enjoyment. But the seed which he had sown was taking root in all manner of unexpected places. Slowly but surely his teaching has revolutionized political economy. The old political economy, blameless and even admirable as were the aims of its professors, had helped in a sense to poison the springs of life. It had corrected the fallacy that "wealth" and "money" were convertible terms, only to fall into the deadlier fallacy that "wealth" meant "material possessions and the ability to acquire them." Against this doctrine Ruskin's voice was lifted, in "Unto This Last," in emphatic dissent: "There is no wealth but life:—life including all its powers of love, of joy, of admiration. That country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings, and that man is richest who, having perfected the functions of his own life to the utmost, has also the widest helpful influence, both personally and by means of his possessions, over the lives of others." This does not sound very paradoxical now, perhaps. It is hard to realise with what suspicion and contempt the book that contained it was received. Christianity then, as at other times, was saying very much the same thing in other words—"Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." But it is possible for even sincerely religious people to keep their religion and their way of looking at life in curiously separate compartments. And just at this time, as we know from the "Self-Help" books so characteristic of the period, professing Christians were apt to lay a disproportionate stress on the conclusion of the text—"and all these things shall be added unto you." Happily, we have all ceased to believe that the unrestricted development of industrial competition will lead us straight to the millennium. The stern logic of facts

would perhaps have convinced us by this time had there been no Ruskin to teach us, but at least we have learnt the lesson sooner for his teaching, and saved some preventible misery by restrictive legislation. Not that he worked alone, even amongst workers with the pen; Charles Kingsley and Mrs. Browning wielded a great influence; but Ruskin's teaching, if less popular at first, went further and prompted more of those inconvenient self-questionings, the stings of the Socratic gad-fly, that are the surest stimulus to real reform. Perhaps even now it is our theory that has advanced, rather than our practice. "We do but skin and flim the ulcerous "place" in our social life. But where theory leads, practice will follow, if with a lame foot. And the silent leavening of English life, in all classes, by those who have assimilated a large measure of Ruskin's ethical teaching, is a good beyond calculation, though it passes unnoticed. "It is quite "possible"—we read in "Fors"—"for the simplest "workman or labourer for whom I write to understand what the feelings of a gentleman are, and "share them if he will; but the crisis and horror of "this present time are that its desire of money, and "the fulness of luxury dishonestly attainable by "common persons, are gradually making churls of all "men." Here and there a working man has heard and obeyed the summons; and far as "a little "candle throws its beams" the good deeds of these quiet heroic lives have "shone in a naughty world," and helped to arrest the churl-making process. Nor is there reason, finally, to suppose that the teaching has been wasted upon those who seem very slow of response to it. Walter Bagehot, a true man of the world, but illuminated by culture to a degree very unusual in men of the world, said that Dr. Arnold's teaching was very bad for the sensitive, too impressionable Clough, but the best possible thing for the average boy, "the small apple-eating animal "whom we know." So the practical man, with his contempt for ideals, owes the idealist something after all—nothing less, perhaps, than that softening of his hard nature which saves him from becoming quite intolerable.

Of the four handsome volumes of "Fors" it only seems necessary to add that they are indispensable for a complete study of Ruskin's life and work, and that they contain many delightful treasures of wit and wisdom and beauty. Those who know little of Ruskin's moral teaching will, however, find more systematic and perfect exposition of it in such works as "Unto This Last" and "The Crown of Wild "Olive."

"I think it is a great mistake, and indeed I think it is a dangerous mistake, to suppose that you can regard the army in India as an army upon which you can indent for general Imperial purposes."—Lord Ripon.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Some particulars with reference to the two Indian witnesses, Mr. D. E. Wacha and Professor G. K. Gokhale, who have recently given evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure may be of interest, especially as arrangements are being made for them to address meetings in England on the Indian question before they return home.

Mr. D. E. Wacha has been one of the hon. secretaries of the Bombay Presidency Association since its formation in 1885 "for the advocacy and promotion of the public interests of India by all legitimate and constitutional methods." He is also Joint General Secretary of the Indian National Congress, a member of the Bombay Municipal Corporation, the managing agent of a large and flourishing cotton mill, and a member of the managing committee of the Bombay Millowners' Association. Mr. Wacha is a well-known figure at meetings of the Congress, and of the Bombay Provincial Conference, and one of the most energetic and capable contributors to the Indian press.

Professor G. K. Gokhale is hon. secretary of the Deccan Sabha, an association established in Poona for the promotion under British rule of the political interests of the Indian people. He was for seven years hon. secretary of the Poona Sarvajanic Sabha—a political association of a similar kind—and honorary editor of its quarterly journal, dealing chiefly with questions of Indian administration and finance. Professor Gokhale is also a member of the Bombay Presidency Association, and was for four years one of the secretaries of the Bombay Provincial Conference. He was a secretary of the 11th Indian National Congress, which met at Poona in 1895. For four years he was one of the editors of the *Sudharak* or *Reformer*—an Anglo-Marathi weekly published at Poona. Mr. Gokhale is Professor of History and Political Economy in Fergusson College, being one of a body of young Indians—sometimes called "the Indian Jesuits"—who, in view of the Government's neglect of higher education, took a vow of poverty, and pledged twenty years of their life to educational work.

With reference to the proposed meetings, in which it is hoped that Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor Gokhale and others will take part, the following circular, signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., has been issued to various political associations in England and Scotland by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress:—

In view of the present prominence of Indian questions, it occurs to us that you might be disposed to hold a meeting in your district for the discussion of the financial and economic problems which the occurrence and the appalling severity of famine in India have forced upon public notice.

It happens that there are now in London several Indian gentlemen of distinction and experience, who have been deputed from India as witnesses at the request of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and who are well qualified to place before an audience at first hand the facts of Indian administration as they appear to Indians themselves. During the next few weeks we expect other Indian gentlemen to arrive in London in order to give evidence before the Royal

Commission, and their services will also be available for public meetings.

If, as we hope, you are disposed to make arrangements for a meeting in your district—whether it be a small meeting in your own club premises, or a public meeting in a large hall hired for the purpose—we shall be happy to co-operate with you. As regards any expense that might be incurred, we should be glad to know what your views are, and to arrive at a friendly arrangement.

So far as our Indian friends are concerned, a meeting might be arranged at your early convenience. On the other hand, it is not probable that these gentlemen will be in England later than the end of June, and, as they hope to speak in various parts of the country, we shall be glad to receive your reply as early as may be. Applications for speakers will of course be dealt with in the order in which they are received.

The evidence given by Lord Ripon before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure has naturally a special interest for Indians. Lord Ripon's administration is remembered in India with gratitude and affection as a period of "peace, retrenchment and reform." Yet, for that very reason, it will be found that in his evidence before Lord Welby's Commission he was not able to give strong support to some of the proposals for modifying the existing financial machinery, because he did not appreciate their necessity. "It so happens," said Lord Ripon, "that I had no difference of opinion upon questions of economy with any of the gentlemen who were Finance Members of Council in my time." And again: "I think that the gravity of the financial question was undoubtedly appreciated by the Government of which I was the head; and I am quite sure that all the representations of the Finance Member received the utmost attention from the Council of the Governor-General. I claim for the Government with which I was connected that we were an economical Government. We reduced expenditure and we reduced taxation." Precisely, but unfortunately—*tempora mutantur*.

As regards financial anxiety in India, Lord Ripon said:—

"You must be always anxious about finance in India, partly for the reason that the revenue in India increases very slowly, and a considerable portion of it (that, for instance, derived from opium) is very uncertain; and, besides that, we had already beginning in my time those difficulties brought about by the state of exchange which has become latterly so great a financial evil in India; and, as I have said, the difficulty of finding new sources of taxation, without resorting to measures that might be oppressive, is always present. The finances of India are inelastic, and you have little to look to in the way of increase from ordinary taxation."

"No doubt," added Lord Ripon, "there has been a more forward policy since 1885 than there was before. Personally, I have never been in favour of a forward policy; and while I was connected with the Government of India there was no forward policy. For various reasons which I do not want to enter into, because I am not the person to speak to them, the military expenditure in India has increased since my time." Later, Lord Ripon said, significantly enough:—

"You know there are always persons who are urging frontier expeditions, and it is sometimes by no means easy for the Government to resist that pressure. But if the Government were determined to resist frontier expeditions unless they were absolutely necessary, I think you would find that the number of them would very greatly decrease."

On the question of apportionment, Lord Ripon said

that he did not think the analogy of partners was quite suitable. "There are forcible grounds for favourable consideration towards India in regard to the charges which are to be divided between the two Governments."

"Two partners have, as I understand it, the same kind of interest in the undertaking. In all probability they are conducting one undertaking in which they have both a common interest. Now, there are points—in regard to military expenditure, for instance, or in regard to the amount that is to be charged to India for any particular expeditions outside India—in which the interest of the two partners, as you propose to call them, would be not the same but different."

Lord Ripon made an interesting and important suggestion with regard to the proposals which have been put forward with the view of enabling Parliament to deal more effectively with Indian finance:—

"I fully recognise the unsatisfactory nature of the discussions that take place on the Indian Budget in these days under the present system. I think that that is very unsatisfactory, and I should like to see it amended. I have no particular objection to the appointment of a Select Committee, though whether it would have the desired effect or not, I do not know. . . . I should like to make one remark. Under the old system of the East India Company it came about that, as their charters were granted for limited periods, when that limited period was nearly run out, Parliament was in the habit of appointing a very important committee, upon which it generally put, if I am not mistaken, some of the foremost men in the House of Commons, to look into the whole question of the Indian Government during the period of the expiring charter, and to make a full report upon the whole subject. Now, it has often struck me that by the abolition of the East India Company, and the fact that there are no limited charters now running out, that solemn (if I may say so) enquiry by the principal men in Parliament does not take place; and I have thought that it might now be a very good thing to have such an enquiry regularly fixed, not yearly, because that is a great deal too short an interval, but at considerable intervals, so that at the expiration of a certain period of years a Committee of the kind I have mentioned should be appointed to look into the state of the Indian Government. I think you would deal with policy more thoroughly in that way than you would with your annual Committee examining the Budget."

Lord Ripon, replying to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, said that in his judgment the government of India, speaking broadly, must be paid for by India herself. "The advantage which England derives from the possession of India is a very large question upon which a great deal might be said both ways."

We understand that an article by Mr. Alfred Webb (formerly President of the Indian National Congress), upon the grievances of British Indian subjects in South Africa, will shortly appear in the *New York Nation*.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Sir James Lyle Mackay, K.C.I.E., to be a Member of the Council of India in succession to Mr. Robert Hardie, whose tenure of office has expired.

The Lord Mayor's Fund at the Mansion House for the relief of the sufferers by the famine in India reached and exceeded on April 23rd the sum of £500,000. The fund was opened on the 9th of January, and this sum has been raised in fifteen weeks. The amount, however, does not yet beat the 1877 record, when for the Indian Famine Fund £515,200 was raised; but there is said to be little doubt that this total will be exceeded before the present fund is closed, as various remittances are known to be on their way from the Colonies.

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

IMPORTANT LETTER FROM MR. P. M. MEHTA.

The following is the text of the communication addressed to the Secretary of State for India, Lord George Hamilton, M.P., by the Hon. Pherozeabhai M. Mehta, C.I.E., as Chairman of a public meeting recently held at Bombay:—

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

The following Resolution was unanimously adopted at a Public Meeting of the citizens of Bombay, held under the auspices of the Bombay Presidency Association, in the Framjee Cowasjee Institute, on the 26th day of September, 1896:—

"This Meeting resolves that the Chairman be authorised to address Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, soliciting his attention to the hardships and disabilities under which Her Majesty's Indian subjects in South Africa are at present suffering, as set forth in the various Memorials presented on their behalf, and imploring him to take suitable measures for their redress."

In accordance with the above Resolution, I beg respectfully to submit the following for your consideration.

From the various Memorials and Pamphlets distributed and the Address delivered at the meeting, it appears that throughout South Africa the Indian British subjects of Her Majesty labour under grievances of two kinds, viz.: (a) those due to the ill-feeling exhibited by the European Colonists towards the Indians, and (b) those due to law.

Owing to the grievances of the first kind, it seems that the Indians cannot travel on the railways or tramways without frequent molestation throughout South Africa, and the South African Republic has even passed a law making it illegal for any coloured person to travel 1st or 2nd class in the Netherlands carriages. The instances cited in one of the pamphlets distributed at the meeting, copy of which I have the honour to enclose for your perusal (Enclosure A), if true, certainly disclose a very regrettable state of things in South Africa. They may be pushed off the foot-paths, and they cannot use the public baths. The Government Schools, according to the speaker at the meeting, are not open to the Indians. Altogether, the Indian is a hated being throughout South Africa; he is shunned as a pariah. Every Indian is a coolie without distinction.

A perusal of the Address, copy of which is also herewith enclosed (Enclosure B) and the pamphlets, in my humble opinion, makes out a very good *prima facie* case for a State inquiry. It is, of course, true that the intervention of Her Majesty's Government with respect to such grievances can only be indirect and slow. But an expression of an emphatic opinion may do much to allay the unreasonably strong feeling that seems undoubtedly to exist in South Africa towards the Indians.

I beg to take the liberty to quote a very apt suggestion made by the London *Times* in a leading article, dated the 31st August, 1895, which, after expressing its sympathy towards the Indians in South Africa, thus concludes:—

"The steady growth of the population of India is such that a certain outward movement is inevitable and it is a movement

that will increase. It is very desirable that our white fellow-subjects in Africa should understand that there will in all probability be this current flowing from India, that it is perfectly within the right of the British Indian to seek his subsistence at the Cape, and that he ought, in the common interests of the Empire, to be well treated when he comes there. It is, indeed, to be feared that the ordinary colonist wherever settled thinks much more of his immediate interests than of those of the great Empire which protects him, and he has some difficulty in recognising a fellow-subject in the Hindu or the Parsee. The duty of the Colonial Office is to enlighten him and to see that fair treatment is extended to British subjects of whatever colour."

Before quitting this portion of my letter, I beg to quote a few extracts from the *Times of India* which seem to corroborate the story of the grievances unfolded in the Address and the pamphlets referred to above.

In the course of a leading article on the Indian question in Africa, dated the 27th August, 1894, that journal observes:—

"It will strike most people in this country and at home, too, we hope, as a singularly narrow-minded and unconstitutional act of policy on the part of the legislature of Natal to lend—for that is what it practically comes to—their countenance and sympathy to the European Colonists there in their cruel and persistent persecution of the large body of Natives of India. They have been wantonly assaulted in the streets and been unable to obtain redress from the courts. They have been robbed and outraged and reviled for presuming to exist at all . . . and they have been persistently denied the status of citizens."

The following occurs in a contribution from the *Times'* own correspondent in its weekly issue, dated the 19th September, 1896:—

"The European population of Durban numbers some 16,000, being exactly equal to the black population, of whom the majority are Indians, called here without distinction 'coolies,' and hence giving great offence to the better classes of Memon and Khojah Traders of Bombay. The colonial distinction between black and white runs in Natal to a great height, and grievous and sore are the consequences therefrom to the weaker party—the blacks, or, rather, the Indians. . . . I am told that a coolie may be kicked or flogged . . ."

The various States in South Africa in one way or another have countenanced and encouraged this bitter feeling by passing legislative enactments to suit the fancy of the European Colonists.

Natal has been the most active of late in passing such legislation. The Indian Memorial (Enclosure C) with respect to the Franchise Act of 1896 of the Natal Parliament is, it appears, still under consideration by Her Majesty's Government. The Memorial against the first Franchise Bill, now happily repealed, owing to the firm attitude taken up by Her Majesty's Government, and the Memorial just now referred to, seem conclusively to establish that the real object of such legislation is not to protect against future preponderance of the Indian over the European vote, but to degrade the Indians, so that it may not be worth the while of a respectable Indian trader to seek his livelihood in Natal. Under the circumstances, and in view of the fact that the present Bill is also a piece of class legislation, it is difficult to understand what induced the Right Honourable Mr. Chamberlain to approve of the terms of the Bill which, it appears from the papers published in the *Natal Government Gazette*, was submitted to him for approval by the Ministers of Natal before being introduced into the Local

Parliament. The arguments and facts brought forward in the Indian Memorial, I venture to trust, will enable the right honourable gentleman to reconsider his views, and save the Indian community in Natal from much future trouble and vexation. It cannot, I humbly think, be disputed that the Bill has been made purposely ambiguous, and leaves loopholes for endless litigation and agitation—a thing to be discountenanced in the interests of all the communities residing in Natal. The contention of the Memorial, that if it is at all desirable to restrict the Indian Franchise, the object can be gained without resort to class legislation of so doubtful a nature as the present Bill, by imposing a reasonable educational test or increasing the property qualification with respect to all classes of voters, seems to be very just, and I beg to commend it to your earnest consideration. The opinion of the *Natal Mercury*, the Government organ in Natal, cited to establish the justness of the prayer, should not a little influence the decision of Her Majesty's Government in the matter. Looked at from the stand-point of the Indians in Natal, there cannot, I venture to think, be two opinions as to the fate of the measure.

I regret very much to notice from the Natal papers that the Natal Immigration Law Amendment Bill has received the royal sanction, and that it came into force as from the 18th day of August, 1896. The decision on that question is a sad blow to Indian enterprise, and an encouragement to the Colonists to still further prosecute their war of opposition against the Indians. It is wholly unexpected, in that Natal is the first colony to receive such favourable terms in spite of strenuous opposition on behalf of the Indians concerned. It is difficult to conceive any reason to justify a measure which, according to the extracts given in the Indian petition, was only ten years ago universally condemned by the most eminent Natalians, including the present Attorney-General of Natal. The reasons publicly given to justify the measure are too selfish to deserve consideration.

It is difficult not to sympathise with the statement of the Indian Memorialists that the Immigration Law Amendment will frustrate the very object of emigration. A state which in the words of the *London Times* (13th September, 1896) "comes perilously near to slavery," viz., perpetual indenture, cannot but degrade those labouring under that state.

Many of the eminent Natalians whom the Memorialists quote seem to have agreed that it is better to stop further immigration than to pass a measure which to them seemed so utterly iniquitous. (Enclosure D.) And I feel constrained respectfully to urge that view for your serious consideration. The terms of indenture under the new Act are such that they will in no wise benefit the Indians, whether those serving under such a contract or whether those of their brethren in India relieved by them. I submit that the Indian Government are in no way bound to oblige the Colonists of Natal without any corresponding advantage.

"The whole system of Indian immigration," says the *London Times* "under indentured service for periods of years is regulated by legislative precau-

tions. Those precautions are based partly on the ground that the indentured labourer, notwithstanding explanations, often does not really apprehend the ultimate consequences of his contract, and partly with a view to prevent his contracted service being used as a preliminary for his permanent enslavement in a distant country." The objects to be secured by such precautions are evidently frustrated by the amending Act. "The Government of India," continues the *Times*, "has one simple remedy. It can suspend emigration to South Africa, as it has on previous occasions suspended such emigration to foreign possessions, until it obtains the necessary guarantees for the present well-being and future status of the immigrants. The Government of India may well shrink from inflicting such inconvenience and loss upon a friendly British possession. It is eminently a case for sensible and conciliatory action on both sides. But the Indian Government may be forced to adopt measures in connection with the wider claim which is now being urged by every section of the Indian community, which has been explicitly acknowledged by Her Majesty's Government at home—namely, the claim of the Indian races to trade and labour with the full status of British subjects throughout the British Empire and allied States."

The system of passes and what is known as the 9 o'clock rule, whereby coloured people are required to produce passes if out after 9 p.m., are alluded to in the memorials and discussed at length in the pamphlets. They show a lamentable want of respect for the feeling of the Indian population, and the working of the law with regard thereto, if the facts quoted in the pamphlet (Enclosure A) be true, is far from satisfactory. I venture to feel sure that those disabilities are so serious that they will receive your very great consideration, which they deserve.

The Crown Colony of Zululand has gone further even than the self-governing Colony of Natal in that the regulations for the Townships of Eshowe and Nondweni prevent the Indians from owning or acquiring property. The Memorial about those disabilities is, I understand, still engaging attention, and I trust I need not doubt that in this case full justice will be speedily done to the Indians by the abrogation of the rules, so far as they impose restrictions on the freedom of the Indians to buy property. (Enclosure A.) I venture to submit that their existence on the Statute book constitutes a blot on British justice and name, and they are there only because they were not brought to the notice of Her Majesty's Government earlier. I am now referring to the Eshowe regulations, which were passed some years ago.

While the Indians do not get everything they want or that might have been given them in the South African Republic, the very sympathetic Despatch from the Right Honourable Mr. Chamberlain leaves nothing to be desired. I would, however, venture to remind Her Majesty's Government of the promise made to make friendly representations to the Transvaal Government, and beseech that they may be of such a character as to gain their object. This is all the more necessary, in view of the fact that a departure from the strict meaning of the

London Convention was assented to without the knowledge of the Indian Government and without the Indians affected thereby having a say in the matter.

There are other matters in reference to the Transvaal not covered by the despatch. The pass and the 9 o'clock rules, it appears, exist in the Transvaal. The Indians there are by law prevented from travelling 1st or 2nd class on the railways. These disabilities might be easily removed by a strong representation from Her Majesty's Government. I venture to hope that the restriction of the meaning of the phrase "the British subjects" occurring in the commando treaty which has been made the subject of an Indian Memorial (Enclosure F) will not be assented to by Her Majesty's Government. A foot-path bye-law in Johannesburg, it seems, prevents Indians from walking on the foot-paths!

The Orange Free State has made the "British Indian" an impossibility, and, according to the pamphlet hereinbefore referred to (Enclosure A), has driven away Indian traders without any compensation, causing to them a loss of nearly £9,000, and has passed laws preventing the Indians from settling in that Republic except under certain degrading conditions, and in any case making it illegal for an Indian to acquire landed property, to trade or farm. While it is true that Her Majesty's Government cannot interfere with the acts of the Free State Volksraad, it is, I submit, a question whether a friendly and allied State can shut its doors against any portion of Her Majesty's subjects without just and good reasons.

The speaker at the meeting also drew attention to the East London Municipality Act recently passed by the Cape Parliament. It was not made clear whether the Act has received the Royal assent. It gives power to the East London Municipality to frame bye-laws preventing Indians and other coloured people from walking on the foot-paths and living anywhere else except in specified localities.

All such legislation suggests one question—viz., the question of the status of the British Indians outside British India. Her Majesty's Gracious Proclamation of 1858 guarantees to the Indians equal rights with all other British subjects, and a despatch from His Excellency the Right Honourable the Marquis of Ripon, while Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, recognizes that principle specially with regard to the Indians in Natal. It is evident that all the laws passed by the Colonial Legislatures and referred to above are in direct violation of the Proclamation and the terms of the said despatch.

This, I submit, is pre-eminently an Imperial question. The British subject theory would be a mockery if Her Majesty's Indian subjects cannot enjoy the ordinary rights of citizenship in Her Majesty's dominions outside India or in allied States. If the Indian can be treated as he is being treated in South Africa, he ceases to be a British subject except in name. I appeal to Her Majesty's Government to do away with such a glaring anomaly by once for all declaring class legislation of the description above-mentioned illegal, so far as the Colonies are concerned.

I have not examined the causes that have led the various States to restrict the freedom of the Indians, as the official reasons put forward by the other States are more or less the same as those advanced by the South African Republic, and as the Right Honourable Mr. Chamberlain's Despatch alluded to above does not attach any weight to those reasons, and practically accepts the statement made by the Indian Memorialists that trade jealousy is the root of all the evil.

The London *Times* has eloquently pleaded the cause of the British Indians in South Africa, and I shall venture to close this somewhat long letter by quoting a few extracts from the various articles devoted by that influential journal to the Indian question in South Africa.

Dealing generally with the question, it says in a leading article, dated the 31st August, 1896:

"The incident is one of those which suggests wider questions than any that directly offer themselves for official replies; we are at the centre of a world-wide empire at a period when locomotion is easy and every day becoming easier both in time and cost; some portions of the empire are crowded, others are comparatively empty, and the flow from the congested to the under-peopled districts is continuous. What is to happen when subjects different in colour, religion and habits from ourselves or from the natives of a particular spot emigrate to that spot for their living? How are race prejudices and antipathies, the jealousies of trade, the fear of competition to be controlled? The answer, of course, must be by an intelligent policy at the Colonial Office."

Again, in another article, dated the 6th September, 1895, the same journal proceeds:

"The question with which Mr. Chamberlain was called upon to deal cannot be so easily reduced to concrete terms. On the one hand, he clearly laid down the principle of the equal rights and equal privileges of all British subjects in regard to redress from foreign States. It would, indeed, have been impossible to deny that principle. Our Indian subjects have been fighting the battles of Great Britain over half the old world with a loyalty and courage which have won the admiration of all British men. The fighting reserve which Great Britain has in the Indian races adds greatly to her political influence and prestige, and it would be a violation of the British sense of justice to use the blood and the valour of these races in war, and yet to deny them the protection of the British name in the enterprises of peace. The Indian labourers and traders are slowly spreading across the earth from Central Asia to the Australian Colonies, and from the Straits Settlements to the Canary Islands. Wherever the Indian goes he is the same useful, well-doing man, law-abiding under whatever form of Government he may find himself, frugal in his wants and industrious in his habits. But these very virtues make him a formidable competitor in the labour markets to which he resorts. Although numbering in the aggregate some hundreds of thousands, the emigrant Indian labourers and small dealers have only recently appeared in foreign countries or British Colonies in numbers sufficient to arouse jealousy and to expose them to political injustice. But the facts which we brought to notice in June, and which were urged on Mr. Chamberlain by a deputation of Indians last week, show that the necessity has now arisen for protecting the Indian labourer from such jealousy and for securing to him the same rights as other British subjects enjoy."

Commenting upon our remarks in the last number of *INDIA*, the *Bradford Observer* wrote (leading article, April 3rd): "The course of affairs in South Africa has thrown into very striking relief a question which is of considerable present moment, and likely to be of increasing Imperial importance as the years go by—the question of the treatment of British Indian subjects in British colonies other than India. Just now there is a loud-throated profession, both at South Africa and at home, of the sense of obligation to native races under our rule. Mr. Chamberlain formulates the principle; and the South African

Imperialist asserts the necessity which is laid upon him to see that it is practised—by the Boers. That the Boers should regard the blacks as anything less than men and brothers appeals to the Cape Imperialist as the very height of man's inhumanity to man; and his indignation at the decoration and degradation of the Cape boy by a compulsory badge as soon as he crosses the Transvaal border, knows no bounds. He sheds tears over the indignities suffered by his black coachman, and founds upon them frantic appeals to Mr. Chamberlain to bring the Boer to a sense of his duty by supplementing protest with artillery. In these evidences of a tender and sympathetic interest in the natives of South Africa philanthropy might well find a new hope for the regeneration of the world, if it were not for the fact that, side by side and in startling contrast with this sham protest, runs a record of racial arrogance and injustice more contemptible than any that the Boer can show. Most newspaper readers will readily recall more than one recent story of the invincible hostility of British colonists in Natal and elsewhere to British Indian emigrants, and the situation is excellently summed up in a brief statement in the current number of INDIA—a record and review of Indian affairs which every Englishman with the due sense of "obligation" would do well to study. The summary is based in part upon a memorial drawn up a few months since by Mr. Pherozeshah Mehta and presented to Lord George Hamilton, but the facts are too notorious to be in doubt or dispute. "Throughout South Africa British Indian subjects of the Crown are not only subjected to the most humiliating indignities by European colonists, but they are harassed by legal disabilities of the most vexatious and injurious kind. Indians, for example, cannot travel on the railways or tramways without frequent molestation. In some parts of South Africa they are prohibited by law from travelling in any class but the third class. They are pushed off footpaths, and excluded from the public baths and Government schools. 'Altogether,' as Mr. Mehta says, 'the Indian is a hated being throughout South Africa; he is shunned as a pariah. Every Indian is a coolie without distinction.'" By the new Franchise Law Amendment Act in Natal British Indian subjects are excluded from civic rights—the motive being not so much one of fear that in some remote future the Indian vote may preponderate, as one of hostility to the presence at all in the colony of any respectable Indian trader. It is of a piece with the recent violent demonstrations against Indian labour, and part of what has come to be persistent persecution of those to whom, in common with other British subjects, the Queen's proclamation of 1858 guaranteed equal rights. These Indian Uitlanders of the British South African Colonies raise no objection to any reasonable educational test—a fair number of them at least are better educated, better men, better gentlemen, and more loyal subjects of the Queen than a considerable proportion of their white "fellow-subjects;" they raise no objection to a high property qualification. But the British Boer, who is every whit as narrow and prejudiced in his own way as his neighbour of the Transvaal, will hear nothing of any plea for justice in this matter. Black to him is black, whether Indian or Cape boy; and white is white, whether millionaire adventurer, or the outcast scum of the mother country; and to the Indian trader he will deny for his colour the civic rights he accords to the man whose proper place would be an English gaol. For the white Uitlander of the Transvaal nothing is good enough; but the black Uitlander of Natal is only so much dirt, to be shovelled out of place as quickly as may be. It is, as Mr. Gordon Hewart urges, "a grim commentary upon Mr. Chamberlain's menaces to President Kruger with reference to the grievances of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal" that the related grievances of these British subjects in British Colonies should remain unredressed and unheeded. For two years their protest has been urged upon Mr. Chamberlain's attention—urged not unreasonably, but merely with intent to elicit "an expression of emphatic opinion," which it is believed might "do much to allay the strong feeling that seems to exist in South Africa towards the Indians." Mr. Chamberlain, however, has apparently used up all his emphasis in addresses to the South African Republic, and has none left to give practical force to his ideals of kinship and obligation as between British subjects of different races. None the less, the matter is a crying scandal to English rule, and the mischiefs to which it is laying the train are graver than most Englishmen seem to recognise.

The *Newcastle Leader* wrote: The current number of INDIA contains a timely criticism of Mr. Chamberlain's attitude towards the Boer Republic. Our contemporary refers to an inconsistency to which we draw attention a few days ago—the treatment of our Indian subjects in Natal. The policy of the Colonial Secretary in this matter forms a curious comment upon his sympathy for the Uitlanders. British Indian subjects in our South African colonies are denied civil rights. We are told that "Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been for two years, and still is, in communication with Mr. Chamberlain on this subject, but so far, it would appear, with very little practical result." Notwithstanding protests from both India and South Africa, no effort has been made to remove the disabilities from which the Hindoo population in Natal suffer. The Colonial Secretary has "declined to disallow the new Franchise Law Amendment Act in Natal" which ignores the claim of our Indian fellow subjects to civic rights. The attention of Lord George Hamilton was also drawn to the matter in December last, but nothing whatever has been done or is likely to be done. When we consider that Mr. Chamberlain's sympathy with the hard case of the Uitlanders is endangering the peace of South Africa, these facts are exceedingly suggestive, and throw a curious light upon the present policy of the Colonial Office.

The *Star* wrote: We have from time to time called attention to the grave disabilities and indignities under which British Indians suffer in South Africa, and we are glad to see that the London Indian Society—a vigorous and useful organisation of Indian gentlemen resident here—is once more pressing the matter upon Mr. Chamberlain's notice. So far as argument is concerned, the London Indian Society ought to have no difficulty at all. It has only to take Mr. Chamberlain's references to the grievances of Uitlanders in the Transvaal and apply them *a fortiori* to the grievances of British Indians in our own South African colonies. The grievances of our Indian fellow subjects, it is true, extend throughout South Africa. But it is our business to set our own house in order first—and a beginning should be made in Natal and Cape Colony. The Indians, who are among the most loyal subjects of the Queen, and who have been repeatedly guaranteed the equal rights of British citizenship without distinction of caste, colour, or creed, are treated by Englishmen in South Africa as pariahs or lepers. That they are excluded from the franchise is but one matter. They are also subjected to the most odious indignities—pushed off footpaths, restricted as regards tramways and railways, and treated indiscriminately as "coolies," whatever their intelligence, rank, or position may be. The thing is a scandal and a disgrace to the British Empire, and so long as Mr. Chamberlain permits it he is stultifying everything he says with regard to the Transvaal. The Indians have no objection to reasonable restrictions—say, a high property qualification, or some intellectual test, for the franchise. What they detest and cry out against is the offensive "colour line," which has been expressly provided against in the Queen's Proclamation, and which Mr. Chamberlain ought once and for all to prohibit.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

EVIDENCE OF MR. D. E. WACHA AND PROFESSOR G. K. GOKHALE.

We print below a brief abstract of the evidence given by Mr. D. E. Wachha before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure on April 5th and 8th, and some of the most important passages from the first portion of the evidence given by Professor G. K. Gokhale on April 12th and 13th. It is, of course, impossible within our limits of space to attempt a full report of the evidence tendered by these witnesses, but it is hoped that the following account may convey some useful idea of the chief points which were raised:—

Mr. Wachha said that, bearing in mind the alien character of

the administration in India, and the absence of any effective popular voice from the Councils of the Empire, it was essential that the finances of the country should be closely watched and controlled. Sir David Barbour and Sir Auckland Colvin had pointed out the weak spots in the financial machinery of the administration. He agreed with these two distinguished ex-finance ministers, as the sentiments to which they gave expression before the Royal Commission were wholly in accord with those of the Indians. Their experience of viceroys and military members of the Council was very different from that of Sir Evelyn Baring, now Lord Cromer. The last-named had a strong viceroy in Lord Ripon, whose economic instincts were a great source of strength. Costly frontier wars were not the principal features of Lord Ripon's administration. Domestic reforms of an ennobling and far-reaching character occupied his attention. It was not so with the three viceroys who had succeeded him. The joint minute of Sir A. Colvin and Sir C. P. Ilbert on the cost of the additional troops was proof positive that the finance minister was not consulted at the initial stage, and, so far, he could not act as the "watch-dog" of the Indian treasury. A viceroy with military instincts was sure to support the military party in the viceregal council, the net practical result of which was to increase the burdens of the taxpayer.

WANTED: POPULAR REPRESENTATIVES.

Under the circumstances the only effectual remedy was to give greater powers to the popular representatives in the various councils, including the Imperial Council. The best way to keep a check upon public expenditure was to concede unofficial members the privilege of voting on the Budget. Amendments could be brought forward which would tend to reduce expenditure, where expenditure was reasonably susceptible of curtailment. There was no fear whatever of the Government being "swamped," as alleged in certain quarters. Under the constitution of the expanded councils the Government would always have a majority; and if ever a defeat of the Government occurred, it would simply indicate how far the Government was in opposition to popular sentiments and views. Mr. Wacha referred to the innovation introduced by Lord Elgin as to the presentation of public addresses, complaining that recognised public institutions like the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha and the Mahajana Sabha of Madras were asked to delete certain matter from their respective addresses which related to Imperial questions. Mr. Wacha further complained that the civil and military estimates were not made available to members of the viceregal council and recognised public bodies like chambers of commerce and leading political associations. A great deal of uninformed or ignorant criticism might be avoided if the Government made such estimates accessible, say, a fortnight before the publication of the Budget, as the Bombay Legislative Council did. The military estimates were never made public, while the civil estimates were published a year after the date of the Budget to which they referred.

THE "EXCHANGE" BOGEY.

Lastly, in connexion with financial machinery, Mr. Wacha observed that it would be better if a separate account, to be called "Exchange equalisation" or "Reserve," were opened. Whenever exchange realised a better rate than that taken in the Budget, the surplus or the difference should be credited to this account and not hastily utilised in the Budget of the succeeding year as was done by the finance minister in 1896-97. Sir J. Westland disposed of the surplus of over a crore, arising from "improvement" in exchange, by gifting away half a crore to Manchester, by way of reduction of 1½ per cent. on the import duty on cotton goods, and allowing half a crore to the military department for "mobilisation" rendered necessary by the new and burdensome acquisition of Chitral. Exchange was the "lodging-house cat," as Sir A. Colvin called it, to which all the financial disturbances of a given year were attributed. The opening of such an account as Mr. Wacha suggested would, in his opinion, go a great way to give stability to the Budget, the vote of exchange being carefully estimated at the lowest minimum, say 13d. to 14d. It was also suggested that for better control of the finances there should be in the House of Commons a committee of the character proposed by Sir W. Wedderburn; such a committee

could take up questions of expenditure brought by non-official members in the viceregal council and defeated there. In this way the public spirit and energy of such members might be greatly stimulated.

PROVINCIAL ALLOTMENTS.

With reference to Provincial allotments, Mr. Wacha refrained from entering into a historical review of the question, as it was already before the Commission, and the Indian public was fully cognisant of the merits of the case. Mr. Wacha, however, explained the suggestions which he had put forward in his speech in May last before the Karachi Provincial Conference. Revenue, he said, was collected in order to be expended, and it was best to give the Provincials a fixed percentage of expenditure—a percentage which might from time to time be revised. At present the Imperialists absorb too much of the Provincial revenues. The system should be radically altered. The Provincials should contribute a portion of their revenues according to this fixed percentage. The Imperial Government could then cut its coat according to its cloth, and not fritter away a large portion of the revenue, as it did now, on "frontier fireworks" and so forth, leaving the Provincials to starve and shiver. At present there was none to check and control the appropriation of Provincial balances. It was the old question of who should check the custodian. The scheme suggested provided a sort of automatic check on the Imperial Government, while it left the Provincials to work out their own financial independence unfettered. The cardinal idea should be to make every province financially independent like any self-governing country. It was the only way towards progress.

MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

As to the growth of expenditure, Mr. Wacha dealt at length with the details of the matter, observing that both civil and military expenditure had increased greatly since 1885, though the increases really began in 1875. Civil expenditure, though overgrown, was not so bitterly complained of by Indians as military expenditure. Greater expenditure on education, law and justice and so forth, leading to greater moral progress and administrative efficiency, would be reproductive. Useful expenditure on civil works was much to be desired. Military expenditure afforded the chief ground of complaint. During the last 10 years, exclusive of exchange, nearly 40 crores had been spent in this way. But for this expenditure, the revenues could have easily borne the burden of exchange, and that without increased taxation. The yield of the enhanced salt duty, income tax, etc., came, up to 1894, to something like 29 crores of rupees. As matters stood, the financial deterioration between 1885 and 1895 was deplorable. If the frequent suspension of famine grants and the extra benevolences forced from the Provincial Governments were taken into account, instead of there being an insignificant surplus of half a crore in the decade, there was really a deficit of 30 crores. On the other hand, had there not been the extra military expenditure referred to, the position would have been a surplus of over 8 crores and that without taxation, now and increased. As Mr. Morgan Browne had examined the charges of military expenditure, Mr. Wacha refrained from travelling over the same ground. He laid great stress on the inexpediency of increasing the sterling debt which had already grown 70 per cent since 1885. He deprecated the development of railways, which were not quite unmixt blessings. Railways were still a great loss to the State. Since 1848 there had been a loss, under this head, of 51 crores of rupees. The military railways were a source of additional loss. The North-Western railways were a losing concern, and the annual loss therefrom should be debited to military expenditure, and not to railways. Irrigation works were somewhat better, though in the past improvident blunders on a colossal scale were made by taking up insolvent private companies, concerns (like the Orissa Canal Company), entailing a burden of over 2 crores on the taxpayers. Like railways, many of the irrigation canals were of a non-paying character. On the whole, however, the irrigation works were fairly satisfactory. What was wanted now was not railways, but extensive irrigation by wells. If wells were constructed where there was a general liability to drought, the cost would not be so great, while in a few years they might see the whole face of the soil changed in India. There would be greater verdure and increased cultivation. Even protective railways were useless when there was no grain to carry from the province where there was a surplus to another where it

was needed. At present India does not grow sufficient for the entire population. Something like 29 million tons were wanting to feed it.

THE "SIMLA EXODUS."

After referring to other civil charges, Mr. Wacha mentioned the expenses of the "Simla exodus." He said that even now there was a bitter cry against it. He did not know why the Viceregal party could not make a short stay of two months, instead of seven or eight months. If judges worked hard in the sultry heat of Calcutta during the hottest parts of the year, what was there to prevent the Viceroy and his staff from following their excellent example? It was observed that all the warlike expeditions were hatched at Simla. Being far away from the plains, the Government was not in touch with the country. Sometimes important pieces of legislation, of a far-reaching character, were enacted at Simla, while popular representatives were not summoned. For instance, the Amended Currency Act was passed in June, 1893, at Simla, a measure against which almost the entire mercantile classes of the country protested. No representative of these was at Simla at the time save Sir John Mackay, who was well known as a staunch supporter of the official measure.

Mr. Wacha condemned the exchange compensation allowances. It was, he said, false generosity to the civilians at the expense of the taxpayers. The heinousness of this crime lay in the fact that the import duty was specially imposed in order that these tax-eaters might have their exchange cake and that too, when the taxpayers were themselves suffering acutely from the evils of the currency. Mr. Wacha dwelt upon the need for the separation of judicial from executive functions, and referred to the scheme propounded by the Hon. Mr. P. M. Mehta in the Bombay Legislative Council. Mr. Wacha paid, in the earlier part of his evidence, a tribute to Mr. Mehta, saying that he acquitted himself most creditably in the Imperial Council, though the Finance Minister resented his outspoken speech, as, in fact, the Government resent anything emanating from non-official individuals or bodies. Mr. Wacha summed up his evidence upon the growth of expenditure by emphasising the fact that military expenditure was at the root of the financial embarrassments of the Government. All that the Bombay Presidency Association had stated in its three memorials (from 1885 to 1895), which were put in, had been confirmed by the events that had taken place. He agreed with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji that, unless the "foreign agency" which was at the root of the present deteriorated condition of Indian finance was gradually exchanged for native agency, there was no hope of financial reform. Looking from any point of view they came round to this radical evil. There was now a monopoly of all the higher offices of State in the hands of foreign agency. As to the apportionment of the home charges, and the English charges which had for years been foisted on India, there was not much to be said after the volume of evidence already recorded by every viceroy and every other authority who had paid attention to those charges. Mr. Wacha made some useful suggestions in this connexion.

PROFESSOR G. K. GOKHALE.

As regards Mr. Gokhale's evidence, we reproduce here some of the chief passages relating to financial machinery. His evidence on the two remaining portions of the Commission's subject-matter—namely, the progress of expenditure and the apportionment of charges between the United Kingdom and India—is reserved for future issues.

FINANCIAL CONTROL: DEFECTS OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM.

After examining the existing machinery of financial control at some length, Mr. Gokhale thus summed up the defects of the present system:

The whole position may thus be summed up:—

(1) The buffer of the Company's Government which fairly protected Indian interests is gone, and there is no effectual substitute.

(2) We have no effective constitutional safeguards against the misapplication of our revenues for extra-Indian requirements.

(3) The control vested in the Council of the Secretary of State under the Statute of 1858 is rendered almost nugatory by the alteration of its status under recent amending Acts. Further, the mode of recruiting this Council is radically faulty.

(4) The control of Parliament, as against the Secretary of State, has become entirely nominal, owing to the latter being a member of the Imperial executive, with a standing majority behind them. The old periodical enquiry by Parliament and its jealous watchfulness are gone. In fact, we have at present all the disadvantages of Parliamentary Government without its advantages. In the case of all Departments except the Indian, ex-ministers think it their duty, and also feel it to be their interest, to exercise the closest watch on the proceedings of their successors with a view to passing the most adverse criticism that may be possible. In regard to India alone, ex-ministers vie with, and sometimes even go beyond, their successors in extolling all that exists and all that is done. The responsible Opposition in this country thus abdicates its functions in the case of India only.

(5) The Government of India, as at present constituted, cannot be much interested in economy. Almost all internal administration having been made over to Local Governments under the Decentralization Scheme, questions of foreign policy, large public works and military questions absorb almost the whole attention of the Government of India. Further, the Finance Minister excepted, every other member of Council, including, since 1885, the Viceroy, has a direct interest in the increase of expenditure.

(6) Neither in England nor in India is there the salutary check of public opinion on the financial administration. Parliament is ill-informed and even indifferent. And the Supreme and Local Legislative Councils are simply powerless to control expenditure, since the budgets have not to be passed and no resolutions in reference to them can be moved.

PROPOSED REMEDIES.

Coming to the question of remedies, I think it is, in the first place, absolutely necessary that the Indian Budget should be passed item by item in the Viceregal Legislative Council. Government may retain their standing majority as at present, and that means an absolute guarantee that no adverse vote will ever be carried against them. We have no wish to see the Government of India defeated on any point in the Supreme Legislative Council, but the moral effect of recording and, so to say, focussing, by means of divisions, non-official disapproval of certain items of expenditure will, I expect, be very great. It must be remembered that, while large questions of policy can be discussed and settled with advantage only in this country, the details of Indian expenditure can be criticised effectively and with the necessary amount of knowledge only in India. I would also provide that when a certain proportion of the non-official members of the Supreme Legislative Council—say, more than half—are of opinion that the voting of a particular sum by the Council is prejudicial to Indian interests, they may, if they please, draw up a statement of their case and submit it through the Government of India to a Committee of Control, which I venture to suggest, should be created in this country.

The creation of such a Committee of Control is a matter of the most vital importance. A Standing Committee of the House of Commons has been suggested, and would, I think, do very well. Or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council might be entrusted with the work. Or even the Arbitration Committee which now seems likely to be created might do for this purpose, and the duty of reporting to Parliament from time to time on matters of Indian finance may be assigned to it. But, whatever the form, the Committee should have absolutely no powers of initiating expenditure, also like the old so-called Board of Control, it will do more harm than good. The Committee should take cognizance of all appeals addressed to it by the non-official members of the Viceroy's Council, and may also call for papers of its own accord, and exercise general control over the administration of Indian expenditure. The proceedings should be reported to Parliament from time to time. If some such body were called into existence, the mere fact that non-official members will be in a position to appeal to it, thereby putting

the Government of India and the Secretary of State on their defence will have a tremendous moral effect, which will make for economy and sound finance in a very striking manner. There is nothing in this which will in any way affect the directive and executive powers of the Secretary of State or the Government of India. The plan provides only for a reasonable amount of control, and will enable the representatives of Indian taxpayers, who have no powers of controlling expenditure, to make a complaint in a responsible and constitutional manner.

Further, I would suggest that section 55 of the Government of India Act of 1858 be amended. This section, as it stands at present, enacts that "except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external possessions of such frontiers by Her Majesty's forces charged upon such revenues." Now, this only safeguards the controlling powers of Parliament, and does not provide, as is commonly believed, against the diversion of our monies from their legitimate use, the only thing secured being that the sanction of Parliament shall be obtained for such diversion—a sanction that can be obtained without any difficulty. Now, this is not sufficient; and has been of little use in practice, and I would press for an express and absolute statutory provision, giving us a complete guarantee against the misappropriation of our revenues for purposes unconnected with our interests. I therefore beg to suggest that section 55 of the Government of India Act of 1858 be so amended as to provide that, except in case of actual or threatened invasion, the revenues of India shall not be used for military operations beyond the natural frontiers of India, unless, at any rate, a reasonable portion of such expenditure is put on the English Estimates. I would further suggest that the frontiers of India should be definitely declared by Parliamentary statute, and that no extension or alteration of them should be permitted without statutory sanction.

Further, I would urge that the elected members of the Legislative Councils of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, N.-W. Provinces, and now Punjab and Burma, be invested with the power of returning to the Imperial Parliament one member for each Province. Six men in a House of 670 would introduce no disturbing factor, while the House will be in a position to ascertain Indian public opinion on the various questions coming up before it in a constitutional manner. I may mention that the small French and Portuguese settlements in India already enjoy a similar privilege. Here, again, I rely more upon the moral effect of the course proposed than upon any actual results likely to be directly achieved.

The last suggestion that I have to make on this subject is that, as far as possible, Indian Viceroys should be selected from among men who have earned a distinct position for themselves for their grasp of intricate problems of finance. Among the First Ministers of England, no greater names can be mentioned than those of Walpole, Pitt, Peel, Disraeli, and Gladstone. And all these men were great finance ministers. I know men in the very front rank of English politics do not care to go to India; but, all the same, if men noted for their knowledge of finance, like Mr. Goschen, for instance, were induced to accept the Viceroyalty of India, the arrangements would produce decidedly beneficial results. It would be a great advantage to all if the Viceroy, instead of being his own Minister for Foreign Affairs, were to be his own Finance Minister. At any rate, his immediate connexion with the Foreign Department should cease, the Department being placed, like other departments, in charge of a separate member of the Executive Council.

PROVINCIAL FINANCE.

I now come to the very interesting and important subject of Provincial Finance. While gratefully acknowledging that the decentralisation policy has done a great deal of good, even as far as it has gone, I think the time has come when an important further step ought to be taken. It is now fifteen years since this policy was carried to the point at which it now stands, by the Government of Lord Ripon. The fact that

nearly the whole internal administration of the country is in the hands of the Provincial Governments explains why the people of India are so anxious to see the position of Provincial Governments, in the matter of finance, strengthened much more than what it is at present. The expenditure administered by the Provincial Governments is principally devoted to objects which are intimately connected with the well-being of the people, and the larger, therefore, this expenditure, the better for them. The chief defects of the existing arrangements are the following:—

1. The "so-called provincial contracts"—to use Sir James Westland's expression—are really only one-sided arrangements practically forced on the weak Provincial Governments by the Government of India, which is all-powerful in the matter. The contracting parties not being on a footing of equality, the Government of India virtually gives the Provincial Governments such terms as secure the maximum advantage to itself, and the power which it possesses of disturbing the contracts, even during the period of their currency, leaves the Provincial Governments in a state of helplessness and insecurity, and all this is very prejudicial to the interests of the internal administration of the country. A reference to the tables given on pages 47 and 48 of Appendix, Section I, of the evidence recorded by this Commission will at once show how, at each successive revision, the Government of India, while keeping to itself all the growth of revenue which had accrued to it as its share of the normal expansion, has in addition resumed a large portion of the share of growth that had accrued to the Provincial Governments, compelling them thereby to cut down their expenditure in the first year or two of each new contract. Thus, taking Bombay as an illustration, we find that in 1886-87, the last year of the Contract of 1882, its expenditure was Rs. 3,998,912. This expenditure had, however, to be reduced to Rs. 3,814,500 in 1887-88, the first year of the next contract, and it was not till 1891-92 that the level of 1886-87 was again reached, when, at the next revision, it was again put back. The same was the case with almost every other Province. How sore is the feeling of Provincial Governments on this subject may best be seen from the following remarks which the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal thought it his duty to make in the matter in the Supreme Legislative Council last year: "I must say I deprecate the way in which these quinquennial revisions have too frequently been carried out. The Provincial sheep is summarily thrown on its back, close clipped and shorn of its wool, and turned out to shiver till its fleece grows again. The normal history of a Provincial contract is this—two years of screwing and saving and postponement of works, two years of resumed energy, on a normal scale, and one year of dissipation of balances in the fear that, if not spent, they will be annexed by the Supreme Government, directly or indirectly, at the time of revision. Now all this is wrong, not to say demoralising. I say the Supreme Government ought not to shear too closely each quinquennium. It is as much interested in the continuity of work as the Local Governments; and ought to endeavour to secure this and avoid extreme bouleversements of the Provincial finances. . . . It would be an immense gain to local administrations if the Government of India could see its way to renewing the contracts with as little change as practicable on each occasion. It is only in this way that the element of fiscal certainty, which was put forward in 1870 as one of the main objects of decentralization can be secured. Hitherto we have had but little of certainty. A similar protest was made last year by the Lieutenant-Governor of the N.-W. Provinces from his place in the Legislative Council of that Province, and this year the Government of Madras has addressed a very strong remonstrance against the surrender of an additional 24 lakhs of rupees a year demanded by the Supreme Government.

2. There is no fixed or intelligible principle on which these contracts are based, no uniformity in their plan, no equality in the burdens which they impose on the different provinces. The share of Imperial expenditure which the different Provinces have to bear is not determined by any tests of population or revenue. A calculation made by Sir James Westland, and printed on page 400 of the 2nd volume of the Finance Committee's Report, gives the following results.

The proportions or percentages of revenue surrendered

by each Province to the Supreme Government are as follows:—

	Per Cent.
India Districts (General)	26
Central Provinces	56
Burmah	58
Assam	51
Bengal	58
N.-W. Provinces	76
Punjab	45
Madras	52
Bombay	46

The contribution of each Province per 100 of the population is as follows:—

	Rupces.
Central Provinces	71
Burmah	312
Assam	97
Bengal	107
N.-W. Provinces	177
Punjab	82
Madras	123
Bombay	155

These figures are sufficient to show the totally arbitrary character of the present contracts. The fact is that these irregularities are a legacy of the pre-decentralization period, when the expenditure of the different Provinces was determined—as men like Sir Charles Trevelyan, Sir John Strachey, General Chesney, and others have put it—not by the resources or requirements of those Provinces, but by the attention that their Governments succeeded in securing from the Central Government—i.e., by the clamour that they made. And when the first step was taken in 1870 in the matter of decentralization, the level of expenditure that had been reached in the different Provinces was taken as the basis on which the contracts were made, and the inequalities that then existed were, so to say, stereotyped. I think it is high time that an effort was made gradually to rectify these inequalities.

3. The third defect of the existing scheme is that, while it operates as a check on the growth of Provincial expenditure, it imposes no similar restraint upon the spending propensities of the Government of India.

The only way by which these defects could be remedied was clearly pointed out by four members of Lord Dufferin's Finance Committee. They were the President, Sir Charles Elliott, late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir W. W. Hunter, Mr. Justice Cunningham, and Mr. Justice Ranade. In a note which they submitted to the Government of India on the subject, they made the following four proposals, and urged that their adoption would be attended by very beneficial results: (1) That there be no divided departments, but that those departments of receipts and expenditure which are now wholly or almost wholly Imperial, or which it may be found convenient to make Imperial, should be set on one side for Imperial purposes and that the receipts and expenditure of the Provincialized departments should be entirely Provincial. (2) That, whatever the sum be by which the Imperial expenditure exceeds the income from those sources of revenue which are not Provincialized, that sum should be declared the first charge on the Provincial revenues. (3) That the Provincial surplus which arises from the excess of receipts over expenditure should be the fund from which, in the first place, all Imperial necessities should be met, before any increase can take place in Provincial expenditure. (4) And that as regards the future growth of revenue it should, as far as possible, be divided equally between Provincial and Imperial, subject to the condition that if the Imperial exigencies ever required a larger share, the Imperial share should be increased.

Taking the Accounts of 1884-85, Sir Charles Elliott and the other members thus illustrated the working of their scheme. They proposed that opium, salt, customs, tributes, post office, telegraph, mint, interest on debt, superannuation receipts and charges, the East Indian, Eastern Bengal, Guaranteed and Southern Maratta railways, military works, army, exchange and home charges should be wholly Imperial, and that the Government of India should also bear the charges and receive the revenues of the Imperial Districts, i.e., the parts of India which are not included in the Provinces. On the other hand, they proposed that land revenue, stamps, excise, assessed taxes, forests, registration and the civil departments should be wholly

Provincial, such heads as stationery, printing, miscellaneous and railways, canals and other public works as were already Provincial continuing to remain so. The Accounts of 1884-85, exclusive of Provincial rates, were as follows:—

	Imperial.	Provincial.	Total.
	(In Thousands of Rupees.)		
Revenue ..	503,562	175,537	679,109
Expenditure ..	505,085	174,854	679,939

These accounts, on the basis of readjustment suggested above, would have stood thus:—

	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Surplus or Deficit.
	(In Thousands of Rupees.)		
Imperial ..	326,799	505,085	-178,286
Provincial ..	354,307	175,537	+178,770

This means that, on the basis of division proposed, the Provinces would have had to pay about 17½ crores, i.e., about 50 per cent. of the revenues made over to them, to the Imperial Government, to enable the revenue of the latter to come up to its expenditure.

This scheme, if adopted, would have the following advantages over the existing arrangements:—

(a) It would remove all irritation at present felt by the Local Governments, and will secure to them, under ordinary circumstances, half the normal growth of revenues in their Provinces, enabling them thereby to make steady efforts towards the progressive improvement of the internal administration of the country.

(b) It is, of course, not possible to secure at once a complete equality in the burdens which the Imperial expenditure imposes upon the different Provinces. Provinces that contribute less than half their revenues to the Imperial Exchequer cannot be suddenly called upon to reduce their own expenditure and pay their full share with a view to reducing the share of those that at present contribute more than half. Existing facts, after all, must be respected, and the present level of expenditure in the different Provinces must be left untouched. But the effect of contributing to the Imperial Exchequer an equal portion of all future increase in revenue (viz., 50 per cent.) will be that year by year the relation which the contribution of a Province bears to its revenue will tend more and more towards equalization. Thus the Provinces which now pay, say, 60 per cent. of their revenue will, after paying only 50 per cent. of their increase for some years, be found to have dropped down to a ratio of 58 or 57 per cent. And, similarly, in the Provinces which pay less than 60 per cent. at present, the ratio will constantly work itself up to 60 per cent.

(c) The proposed scheme, while making ample provision for the necessities of the Central Government, imposes at the same time something like a check on its spending propensities. It secures to that Government the entire normal growth of the Imperialized items of revenue, and also half that of the Provincialized items, and leaves to it besides the power to demand more than half in times of need. But it is expected that in ordinary years more than half the normal growth of Provincial revenues will not be devoted to non-Provincial purposes.

(d) The adoption of the scheme will place the financial system of India once for all on a sound basis, and will bring it more in a line with the federal systems of finance in other countries, such as Germany, Switzerland, and even Canada and the United States. In these countries, so far as I have been able to gather, the Central and Constituent Governments have their separate resources, but the latter are called upon, in Germany and Switzerland, to make special contributions on extraordinary occasions.

I would add one condition to the foregoing scheme. Even in extreme cases, when the Government of India wishes to take more than 50 per cent. of the growth of Provincial revenues, it should do so only with the previous sanction of the Government of India, and that a formal declaration of the reasons necessitating such a step should be drawn up and sent to the Secretary of State to be placed by him before Parliament.

I am confident that the Provincial Governments in India will welcome such a settlement of the question. Before concluding this portion of my evidence, I may be permitted to remark that it would have been a matter of general advantage, if representatives of Local Governments had come here to give evidence on this subject before the Commission.

“COUNSELLORS OF THE EMPRESS.”

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT.]

The appended document is known to some few of those present on the occasion of Her Imperial Majesty, the Queen-Empress's Proclamation on the plains of Delhi at the New Year, 1877; but it has been forgotten by many who only indirectly heard of the institution inaugurated by the issue of this royal missive. It is not clear whether the “Counsellors of the Empress” then appointed, or their successors, have been called together, either collectively or in groups, for their “counsel and advice;” but this is not material to my present purpose. That is twofold: first, to invite attention to the essentially Imperial quality of the project, and the gracious terms of her Majesty's spontaneous invitation; second, to refer to this duly constituted council of the British Indian Empire as one form of “a tribunal independent of the Government of India,” which, in various shapes, has been proposed or designed at different times since it was first suggested (as I believe) by that wise and excellent Anglo-Indian, long time member for Aberdeen, Colonel Sykes, the last Chairman of the East India Company.

This design of the council as described and constituted at Delhi, is, as will be observed, mainly consultative, also, presumably, for ceremonial purposes. This, it may be taken, is applicable to the higher and more formal functions of such Imperial tribunal; while the more practical form of the institution would include some special judicial procedure quite apart from the High Courts or Judicial Committee—to deal with exigencies such as those in the recent case of the Rájá of Jhalawar, or with disputed successions, as that of Manipur, which, through failure in the ordinary secret executive action by the political department resulted so disastrously. Colonel Sykes's tentative proposal, afterwards expanded by Mr. Prichard, occupies a position between these two extreme functions of the council. The chief object of that sage Director was to obtain some important disinterested authoritative body “to decide between the paramount power and the feudatory.”

These remarks serve to remind one how many details of this comprehensive subject remain to be filled up; but, if it be approached from the top, nothing could be better suited for beginning with than the Queen-Empress's graciously proffered initial plan, which describes Her Majesty as “being desirous of seeking from time to time, on matters of importance, the counsel and advice of the Princes and Chiefs of India.” That Delhi decree in 1877 reads like a recognition of such an aspiration as that expressed by General Sir Le Grand Jacob on the occasion of Mr. Prichard's paper being read in 1870, namely, that there should be some instrument giving practical effect, as he said, to “the noble Proclamation of the Queen, on assuming the direct administration of India.” As to the more special objects and reasons for the definitive organisation of an Imperial Council for India, there are abundant materials to proceed upon when some rising jurist, student of

political science, or, haply, some statesman shall set himself to the task:—

“No. 4. D.C.P.—Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom and Empress of India, being desirous of seeking from time to time, in matters of importance, the counsel and advice of the Princes and Chiefs of India, and of thus associating them with the Paramount Power in a manner honourable to themselves and advantageous to the general interests of the Empire, has authorised me, through Her Principal Secretary of State for India, to confer, and I do hereby confer, in Her name, and on Her behalf, upon the undermentioned Chiefs and High Officers of Government the most honourable title of “Counsellor of the Empress”:

Arbuthnot, the Hon. Sir A. J., K.C.S.I., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).

Bayley, the Hon. E. C., C.S.I., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).

Bundi, His Highness Ram Singh, Maharao Rájá of.

Buckingham and Chandos, His Excellency the Most Noble Richard Plantagenet Campbell, G.C.S.I., Duke of, Governor of Madras (*ex-officio*).

Cashmere, His Highness Ranbir Singh, G.C.S.I., Mahárájá of Jammu, and

Clarke, the Hon. Colonel Sir A., K.C.M.G., C.B., Member of the Council of the Governor-General.

Couper, the Hon. Sir George, Bart., C.B., Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces (*ex-officio*).

Davies, the Hon. Sir Robert Henry, K.C.S.I., Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab (*ex-officio*).

Gwalior, His Highness Jayaji Rao Sindhia, G.C.S.I., Mahárájá of.

Haines, His Excellency Sir F. P., K.C.B., Commander-in-Chief in India (*ex-officio*).

Hobhouse, the Hon. A., Q.C., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).

Indore, His Highness Tukoji Rao Holkar, G.C.S.I., Mahárájá of.

Jaipur, His Highness Ram Singh, G.C.S.I., Mahárájá of.

Jhind, His Highness Raghubir Singh, G.C.S.I., Rájá of.

Norman, the Hon. Major-General Sir H. W., K.C.B., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).

Rampur, His Highness Kalab Ali Khan, G.C.S.I., Nawab of.

Strachey, the Hon. Sir J., K.C.S.I., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).

Temple, the Hon. Sir R., Bart., K.C.S.I., Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal (*ex-officio*).

Travancore, H. H. Rama Varma, G.C.S.I., Mahárájá of.

Wodehouse, His Excellency Sir P. E., G.C.S.I., K.C.B., Governor of Bombay (*ex-officio*).

LATYON,
Viceroy and Governor-General.

Review.

THE STORY OF INDIA.

British India: The Story of the Nations Series. By R. W. FRAZER, LL.B., I.C.S. (retired), Lecturer in Telugu and Tamil, University College and Imperial Institute, etc. (London: T. Fisher Unwin).

For the purposes of the Series, there need be no quarrel with the inclusion of India, notwithstanding the diversity of its teeming populations. Neither need there be any quarrel over the restricted title, though the story goes back to a period long antecedent to the connection of the British with the country. There the British are, and there they are likely to remain; above all, there they have made history in a very remarkable way; and it is now of

extreme importance that the course and the causes of that history should be known as widely as possible, and that the deductions should be drawn with due care and appreciation. Mr. Frazer's task, in spite of its picturesque elements, has been a very difficult one; for the facts are most complicated, and often scattered so as almost to defy welding, while the available space is severely limited. Hence, "throughout the Story attention has been centred more on the main factors which led to the foundation and expansion of British Empire in India than to mere details of military operations or of administration." A general view is no doubt effectively presented, and perhaps with that we ought to be content. Still, with stronger literary power, Mr. Frazer would have been able to weld his matter together more compactly, and to give greater force to particular episodes. In some important points, too, causes and tendencies might probably have been set forth with much larger advantage. The obligation of impartiality in the criticism of policy seems to have been taken to heart with a strictness that tends to diminish the real value of the lessons that the Story might have fairly been used to inculcate. Yet, with all such deductions, the volume still forms a good average member of an admirable and most useful Series.

In a single chapter, Mr. Frazer disposes of everything antecedent to the rise of the East India Company, describing mainly the course of early Indian commerce, but also indicating rather than tracing some leading channels of the interchange of ideas between the East and the West, "the wide-spreading influence of which," he justly remarks, "is even at present but little realised and but seldom acknowledged." To this period belongs the century of Portuguese primacy, and the awakening of English interest to the possibilities of Eastern trading. The second chapter, covering the seventeenth century, sketches the successful rivalry of the English with the Dutch and the French for the monopoly of Eastern commerce, and enforces the supreme importance of the command of the sea. In 1702, the East India Company was reconstituted in the form it maintained down to its supersession by the Crown in 1858. The reader should now have gained "a clear insight into the primary factors underlying British Dominion in India." Secondary causes of but little less influence in fact, though not fundamental, next fall to be explained. The Mughal Empire was falling to pieces; "the people, separated from each other by differences of race, religion, language, customs, and local tradition, lacked the essential elements wherewith to combine in a national sentiment of opposition to the invasion of a foreign power whose resources and strength were secured on the seas." After some account of the Aryan invasion, and of the predecessors of the Aryans, Mr. Frazer concisely pictures the Great Moguls, and suggestively points to "the inevitable law of India, with its enervating climate—that the land can never be long held or firmly governed by a race which does not periodically renew its strength and manhood by fresh recruits drawn from northern or temperate climes." One cannot but feel, however, that there are counter-elements in the problem, and

that these are receiving steady if slow development under the teachings of English rule. As for the final spasmodic efforts of France, or rather of the ill-fated Dupleix, La Bourdonnais, and Lally, Mr. Frazer rightly sets them down as "merely interesting as historical facts, for without a command of the seas France was powerless to compete with England in the East."

In his important chapters on Clive and Warren Hastings, Mr. Frazer ably summarises the results of recent investigations into the main points of controversy, political and personal. Hastings, in particular, has undoubtedly been cleared "from many wildly reckless and even false charges." Without shutting one's eyes to much that must be regrettable to the judgment of history, one can readily understand how Clive impenitently stood "astonished at his own moderation," and how Hastings could honestly vindicate himself in terms of the bitterest and most contemptuous reproach. With regard to Hastings, whose cause Mr. Frazer seems inclined to champion more boldly than he specifically does, he writes on the general question as follows:

As to the essential morality of these colossal intrigues of Hastings, neither his age nor our age, in a compulsory struggle for existence, can judge. The same problem, differing in none of its essential details, lies before us to-day in our determination to hold our possessions in Africa as a field for the outlet of our productions, as well as in the consistent efforts of Russia to gain seaports in the Mediterranean or in the North Pacific, so as to establish a commercial prosperity for herself in the future, by means which are inevitably destined to end in success. All we are concerned with is the fact that Hastings in his dealings with the native powers had but one main ideal before him—that of serving the interests of the East India Company, and establishing on a secure basis the foundation of the British Empire in India, so that the commercial enterprise of the London merchants should have its necessary development. If in this there be discovered any taint of turpitude, not by Hastings alone but by the nation at large must the blame be borne.

Still, however much truth there may be in this argument, it does no more than shift the responsibility; the turpitude, if any, yet remains. Hastings, indeed, might fairly be credited with excuses that are not open to us or to Russia—certainly not to us. For example, Hastings had situations of the utmost difficulty and peril thrust upon him by a policy that he neither initiated nor approved, and he had to save himself and his charge at all hazards. But the general thesis opens up wide vistas of discussion, which will always be peremptorily closed by the supposed requirements of the extension or maintenance of commercial supremacy. In a nation of shopkeepers, morality is inevitably bent to the assumed interests of the shop, or temporarily put aside till a more convenient season. At the same time, there remains much to be done for the adequate exposition of the real bases and conditions of the official conduct of the greatest of our Pro-consuls, though Mr. Frazer has gone as far as he legitimately could on the present occasion. The case of Nanda Kumar must be taken to be conclusively settled by Sir James Fitzjames Stephen in favour of Hastings, and that is one remarkable vindication.

The policy inaugurated by Clive and Hastings found its natural development in the subsequent conquests and annexations that constitute the

popular landmarks of later Indian history. Mr. Frazer gives a fair account of the disastrous Permanent Settlement under Lord Cornwallis—disastrous immediately and permanently—though he somewhat weakly characterises it as not “particularly successful.” He shows how “the insanely vaunting Sultan of Mysore, the proud Nizam of Haidarabad, the puppet Nawab Wazir of Oudh, the fierce Maratha chiefs Sindhia, Holkar, the Bhonsla, the Gaekwar, and the Peshwa, were one and all forced to bow their heads before the imperious dictates” of the iron Wellesley. Though the wars against the Pindaris, the Ghurkas, the Pathans, and the Mahrattas require just notice, yet Mr. Frazer might have been expected to make room for some more adequate indication of the works of peace during the administration of the Marquess of Hastings. What may be called the modern history of British Administration in India commenced under Lord William Bentinck, whose work opened with an operation now ominously familiar—the restoration of financial equilibrium after a war, the Burmese war of Lord Amherst. The abolition of Sati, and the suppression of the Thags are prominently mentioned; but it is unjust to Colonel Sleeman to say no more than that his and Colonel Meadows Taylor’s writings effectively “drew public attention” to the latter subject. With Lord Auckland, Afghanistan comes unpleasantly into the story, and that “very advantageous, useful, and humane piece of rasquality,” the annexation of Sind. Under Lord Hardinge, we have the marvellous history of Rangit Singh, and the first Sikh war; and under Lord Dalhousie, a strong course of annexation, beginning with the Punjab. The Mutiny is generally well narrated, though the various causes might be more definitely valued, and the essential points of the various critical emergencies might be more precisely touched. The later summary calls for no particular remark, except that it is crushingly abbreviated.

The final chapter also suffers seriously from inevitable compression. It sets out the main heads of the moral and material progress of the country under British rule. Without putting it strongly, Mr. Frazer yet points out that there “may be limits” to military operations and provisions “beyond which no Government, with a due regard to financial considerations, can prudently advance.” He further says, quite justly and properly, that “the revenues of India, from which these increasing expenses of the army, military defences, civil administration, and loss by exchange have to be met, are raised for the greater part from that portion of the population least able to bear any increase of taxation.” He speaks plainly enough about the “grave danger” of the steady ousting of the peasantry by law in favour of the usurer—a danger recently emphasised in these columns by Sir William Wedderburn, and in the Governor-General’s Council by Sir Griffith Evans. In conclusion, he quotes Sir Alfred Lyall’s statement of “England’s prime function in India at present”: “to superintend the tranquil elevation of the whole moral and intellectual standard.” The general proposition, however, does not take us far: it does not exempt us from vigilant

examination of the practical operations of detail, from time to time proposed. We trust, however, that Mr. Frazer’s book will be widely read, and that it will do something for the popularisation of serious interest in the government of our Indian fellow-subjects.

AS OTHERS SEE US.

“Our able and energetic contemporary.”—*The New Saturday*.

“The best source of current information on the controversies of our great dependency published in England.”—*The Speaker*.

“A record and review of Indian affairs, which every Englishman with the due sense of ‘obligation’ would do well to study.”—*Bradford Observer*.

Reviewing our seventh volume (1896), the *Westminster Gazette* described it as “a well arranged file of carefully prepared articles and statistics on Indian matters which must prove of considerable value to politicians and journalists, and others. Our Eastern dependency is a topic on which there is not only much indifference but ignorance in this country. This a course of study of the columns of INDIA might do something to dissipate.”

“All who are in sympathy with popular native aspirations will be delighted to see the manner in which the political, social and intellectual activities of the Indian movement are reflected in its pages.”—*The Leeds Mercury*.

“The volume of INDIA for 1896 has reached us, and will be found invaluable by students of Indian affairs who sympathise with the development of the native.”—*The Star*.

“Brimming over with interest . . . an excellent periodical.”—*The Western Mercury (Plymouth)*.

“The new number of INDIA contains much instructive matter.”—*The Newcastle Leader*.

“Our esteemed contemporary INDIA.”—*The Englishman (Calcutta)*.

“INDIA, in the hands of a new editor, seems really in a way to perform the difficult feat of making a publication entirely devoted to Indian affairs pay its way in England. Its pages may be looked to for some exposition of most subjects that are before the Indian Government and public.”—*The Pioneer (Allahabad)*.

“Anyone who is desirous of getting to know what is the real sentiment of India on the main questions which concern her welfare, could not do better than read INDIA, which seems to us to place fairly and justly before its readers views which the most enlightened of the Hindus entertain of our rule, and to give a sensible and sound exposition of the policy best suited to the interests of the Hindus and of ourselves.”—*The Huddersfield Examiner*.

“A most useful and admirable publication.”—*The Somerset Express*.

“Although we differ from many of the views expressed in this periodical, we are bound to admit the talent and enterprise with which it is conducted.”—*Indian and Eastern Engineer*.

“A sober and serious magazine . . . with its excellent supplement, which gives a *verbatim* report of Indian debates in the House of Commons during the month.”—*The Army and Navy Gazette (London)*.

“An enlightening monthly serial.”—*The Eastern Morning News (Hull)*.

“An unread newspaper.”—*The St. James’s Gazette*.

Printed by A. BOWEN, 1 & 2, Took’s Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 94 and 95, Palace Chambers, London, E.W.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

[OFFICES: 34 AND 35, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, W.]

VOL. VIII., No. 6.]
(NEW SERIES.)

JUNE, 1897.

[Subscription, Post Free,
Six Shillings per Ann.
In India, Six Shillings]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indians: Notes on Indian Affairs	161	Our London Letter	180
Conciliation or Litigation, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	167	Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, I.—Evidence of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji	182
British Indians in South Africa, I.—By Alfred Webb	169	II.—Evidence of Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee	183
" II.—By G. K. Gokhale	171	A Visitor to the Congress	186
III.—By "An Imperialist"	175	British Rule in India: Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in Edin- burgh	189
India and the "Diamond Jubilee"	177	"A Retiring Civilian"	190
A History of Greek Literature	179	Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	192
		Recent Official Publications	192

Indiana.

THE famine is apparently attracting less and less attention on the part of a public whose leisure is for the moment divided between stirring events in Eastern Europe and preparations at home for the "Diamond Jubilee." Yet, according to the Viceroy's telegram printed in the newspapers of May 20th, the total number of persons on relief is no less than 3,608,000, and although, in the judgment of the Simla correspondent of the *Times*, "the calamitous period which was entered upon last autumn seems slowly drawing to a close," the people of India have certainly not yet come to terms with their unfathomable and inconceivable sufferings. Meanwhile, the *Times* has made an important discovery. It has found out that famine is not, after all, "an affair of climatic conditions alone," but is closely related to "the staying powers of the people." One is inclined to say, in the words of an impulsive member of Lord Salisbury's audience on a recent occasion, "common sense at last!" We should, indeed, have been glad, if space and other circumstances had permitted, to reproduce the articles, apparently only the beginning of a series, which appeared under the heading "Indian Affairs," in the *Times* of April 27th, May 10th, and May 16th. The writer, whose identity is not a very profound secret, addresses himself to "the inevitable discussion of the causes which underlie famine," refusing to admit

that "because the crops fail the people must perish."

"The battle against famine is perceived to be a specific stage in the struggle of man with nature in which everything seems at first on the side of nature, but in which the ultimate victory generally remains with men."

Nor is it enough that "the material resources of civilisation," such as irrigation works and railways, should be "applied suddenly to an Asiatic country." Civilisation has less tangible resources as well.

"The staying power of a people under the strain of a great calamity is the product of the normal well-being of the people in ordinary times, and of the reserve of resources which a high standard of well-being builds up. We thus come to the opposite side of the shield, and, losing sight for the moment of the rainfall and other natural causes of Indian famine, we find that its actual effects depend largely on the permanent prosperity of the people."

There is nothing very startling or novel about all this. But it is, to say the least of it, satisfactory to read it in the columns of the *Times*.

PROCEEDING to discuss the conditions which make for the permanent prosperity of the people, the writer of "Indian Affairs" calls attention to (a) the need of fixity of tenure, with special reference to Orissa and Assam; (b) external emigration, with special reference to the grievances of British Indians in South Africa; and (c) internal development, with special reference to

an equitable system of provincial finance. As to fixity of tenure, the following passage may be interesting:

"Throughout almost all India the Government lets the land to the people on thirty years' leases, and subject to certain provisions can, and as a matter of fact does, raise the rent at the expiry of each term. It thus secures the unearned increment for the State, and is enabled to provide for currency and other financial contingencies by keeping a firm hold on the land. But shrewd observers assert that the absence of a permanent settlement operates as a discouragement to improvement, and that, as a matter of fact, the Government pays dearly for its power to raise the rent by checking the prosperity of the people. . . . In certain parts of India permanence of rent has long been demanded in the interests of the people, and at each recurring famine the demand is repeated with increased force."

And here is an admirable passage upon the system of provincial contracts:

"We cannot truthfully assert that the State has done all that may be fairly expected of it to avert famine while the whole machinery of district development, by which alone the material resources of the country can be drawn forth and the staying power of the people strengthened, is thrown out of gear for the first half of each five years, and carried on during the second half in fear of the next dislocation. The decentralisation of Indian finance has been worked in a way which its projector, Lord Mayo, could not have foreseen, and which he would have been the first to condemn. Continuity is essential to economical progress, and while the population constantly increases the progress of the provinces is, during two years out of each five, impeded or brought to a stand by defective methods of finance."

The passages that one regrets in this series of useful articles are those which give prominence to the bogey of "over-population." The over-population of great areas in India has, we are told, passed into a proverb. No doubt. But is it a truthful and trustworthy proverb? It is employed on all sorts of occasions by all sorts of Anglo-Indians as a convenient excuse, a comfortable theory, with which to answer any and every complaint against a bureaucratic Government. What strikes one about this short way with "grievance-mongers" is that it proceeds rather upon assumption than upon demonstrated facts. Let the champions of the over-population theory give us facts and figures, instead of habitually begging the question. Are they prepared to show that population in India exhibits a higher rate of increase than population in Europe? And—what is of more importance—are they prepared to show how there *can* be over-population of working bees as distinguished from drones? The Indian is proverbially skilful, industrious, and frugal. Given a fair chance he is not only able to earn a bare subsistence, but also produces valuable commodities which reach "the top of the market." The chief difficulty lies, not in the number of Indians, but in faults of administration which keep the workers apart from the materials, direct their industry into wrong channels, and drain out of the country so large a proportion of the products of labour. The

Hindu is advised by some British wiseacres to change his religion. If we are to wait for a better economic condition until that change takes place we shall have to wait a long time. The simpler, more expeditious, and more hopeful method is to remedy the defects of government which are so largely responsible for the impoverishment of the mass of the Indian people.

THE Philosophical Society of Glasgow
A Famine of Money.

has published in pamphlet form a notable address on "Some Aspects of Political Economy from a Commercial Point of View," recently delivered by Mr. George Handasyde Dick, the President of the Economic Science Section of the Society. About one-fifth of this interesting essay is devoted to the present famine in India, than which, in Mr. Dick's opinion, no question in modern history makes "more emphatic call upon economists for light and leading." Here is the "most remarkable phenomenon" to which Mr. Dick invites earnest consideration:—

"With a continent said by some persons to be threatened with the most awful calamity of famine which modern times have ever known, it is but rarely suggested, either in Indian or home papers, that there is any actual scarcity of food to feed all the people. The London Times of 4th February publishes a telegram from the Viceroy asking that money be sent in preference to food. Lord George Hamilton, speaking at Harrow on the 10th instant, stated the Viceroy and himself had arrived at the conclusion that 'with the spring crops there would be sufficient to carry the people on.' We constantly read of higher prices for food, but never that food cannot be abundantly bought at the higher prices. Did the world ever before see such a situation as a famine of money with which to buy food, while sufficient food existed to feed all the people?"

The Indian famine, it would seem, is a money famine, not a food famine. In support of this view, Mr. Dick observes that the rate of interest in the Indian bazaars is not quoted under 16 per cent.; that even at this usurious rate money could hardly be borrowed; and that the Bank of Bombay was refusing loans on Government paper, even at a time when its minimum lending rate was 12 per cent.

"Under these circumstances, and with discount in London under 2 per cent., money would at once and naturally flow to India, were it not that the rate of exchange at which it could be brought back again is so uncertain that even a difference of 10 per cent. in the rate of discount is recognised as insufficient to cover the risk incurred."

BUT Mr. Dick still asks how far the British scarcity of rupees is responsible for the "phenomenal" scarcity of money in India. For, comparing the highest price quoted for rice in India with the current price of wheat in Glasgow, he finds that

"We have eighty millions of people suffering from scarcity inimical to health, or from scarcity threatening death, when

food is apparently abundant enough to feed all, at a price of, say, 68 of a penny per lb. The present price of wheat in Glasgow is 16s. per 240 lb.—80 of a penny per lb."

This conclusion leads Mr. Dick to a reflection which might well have been written by Dr. Dadabhai Naoroji himself, and which has supplied the basis of all intelligent non-official criticism of the present situation in India:—

"Gentlemen," he asks, "has it ever occurred to your minds to conceive of poverty such as the foregoing indicates? Here we have probably the most industrious, the most economical, the most peaceable and well-regulated people in the world face to face with death from starvation, because they have not money sufficient to buy food grain, which can be purchased in the worst case at under a penny per pound. Remember, too, that beyond their food requirements their wants are of the fewest, as neither clothing nor houses are essential in immense districts of that country."

It would, as Mr. Dick says, be unreasonable to suppose that the reduction of the Indian people to starvation point is solely, or mainly, due to the partial failure of one season's rains in a country frequently producing two, sometimes three, crops in the year.

"It may be mainly due to economic causes. Such causes have long been foreseen and pointed out by many economists and by the viceroys and finance ministers of India. Notably has this been done in the remarkable despatch of the Government of India, signed by the Viceroy (Earl Dufferin) and his Council, of date 2nd February, 1886. . . . Read in light of later events, it goes to show that existing troubles in India are mainly due to economic causes for which the people and Government of Great Britain are mainly responsible. The First Lord of the Treasury has been at pains to point out that in this matter the moneyed interests here are permitted to rule the councils of the nation. Probably the permission is used in their own supposed interests. Certainly it has been used in direct opposition to the policy of the Government of India."

Mr. Dick proceeds to contrast in strong terms the charity which is now being meted out to India with the annual drain of India's resources to the United Kingdom:—

"If the dispatch mentioned is correctly regarded to-day as a monument of far-seeing wisdom and statesmanship—its truth demonstrated by experience—consider in connexion with it that this country is now busily engaged, with much unotion to itself, in sending an insignificant charity dole of under a crore of rupees to the Government of India, which Government has for years past been compelled, by the alteration of laws in Europe and America, to send annually to this country Indian produce valued at 8 crores of rupees (at par of exchange £8,000,000) in excess of what the interest it has to pay was reckoned at when the debt was mainly incurred. It is asked—Are we thus in our relation to India, as rulers, reviving ancient barbarians by living in luxury while drawing upon the labours of the subject races of India till these races are impoverished below subsistence point?"

Mr. Dick closed his references to the Indian famine with the "heartfelt prayer" that the mortality might be less appalling than it was in the last great famine.

"Such a record of preventable death would create a record

and memorial of the sixtieth year of the Queen's reign horrible to contemplate; and all the more terrible if it has arisen in despite of the arguments and warnings during many years of those best able to judge and guide. It is a satisfaction, if a poor one, to this Economic Section that every prominent economist has held clear arguments and reasons with regard to this awful matter. A pity and pain it is that perhaps 'the narrowing lust of gold' has not only rendered many hostile to the teachings of economists, but has led them to ridicule, malign, and misname those whose arguments, it is only charitable to suppose, they did not understand."

We make no apology for quoting these copious extracts from Mr. Dick's paper which, we are very sure, will be read with interest and gratitude throughout India. Mr. Dick's arguments are not, of course, new. But that they should be put forward by a Glasgow merchant, who is president of an economic society, is a welcome and encouraging fact. On the particular point that the present famine is not so much a famine of food as a famine of money, it may be interesting to compare with Mr. Dick's address an article, signed "X," which appeared in the *New Century Review* for March last; and on the general question of the poverty of India, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's writings and speeches *passim*—and the summary of his recent evidence before the Royal Commission which we print on another page.

As an indication of the development of The National public interest in Indian questions we may cite the following passage from the last annual report of the Executive Committee of the National Reform Union:—

"The terrible famine which is now devastating a large portion of India has directed public attention to the government of that great dependency, and it has been clearly demonstrated that one of the most fruitful causes of distress and death among our Indian fellow-subjects is the extreme impoverishment of the poorer classes, due to the excessive burden of taxation laid upon the country through the extravagant and wasteful military policy of the governing body, and to the absence of agricultural banks and the unchecked exactions of native usurers. While the native population has become less and less able every year to make provision against drought, there has been an annual increase in military expenditure during the last ten or twelve years of nearly four-and-a-half millions sterling. Your Committee urge that this question of the right government of India is one in which all Liberals should take an active interest, and they advise that special attention should be directed to it by lectures and literature during the coming year."

The National Reform Union, as many of our readers are doubtless aware, is an important "propagandist" association, which, especially, though not solely, in the North of England, advocates by means of leaflets and lectures the policy of the more advanced section of the Liberal party. The President of the Union is Mr. Philip Stanhope, M.P., and the able and energetic Secretary is Mr. Arthur G. Symonds, who is, we believe, connected with India by many

family ties, and loses no opportunity of urging the claims of the Indian people. The National Reform Union has of late years actively co-operated with the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, and has through its numerous lecturers disseminated over a wide area the facts and the doctrines which the Congress seeks to spread.

The Cantonments Question. A CORRESPONDENT writes:—An underlying assumption on the part of some of the military authorities seems to be that prostitution is a necessary evil, and therefore that, recognising it as such, they ought to take steps rather to mitigate its physical effects than to remove the evil itself. But even if, in a given place and for a given time, a rigorous system of examination and detention succeeded in mitigating the physical effects of prostitution, the value of such a system could not be fairly determined without reference to its indirect and remoter results—all the results, that is, which might be expected to follow (not in India alone) from a State system of quasi-insurance against the penal consequences of vice. As it is, however, the system of examination has not been shown to attain even this limited degree of success. The C.D. Acts were not repealed, even nominally, until 1886. Yet the admission rate per 1,000 among British soldiers in India gradually rose from 203 in 1876 to 385 in 1886 (page 15, recent Report). Since 1886 the rate has risen, though not steadily, to 536. But (a) the increase during these ten years after repeal is not greater than the increase during the ten years preceding repeal; and (b) repeal was not rigorously carried out in India. In the home army, where repeal has been rigorously carried out, the admission rate per 1,000 has greatly declined (page 19, recent Report). These facts perhaps render unnecessary the question of casuistry—how much disease must be prevented by the system of examination in order that the gain in health may counterbalance the hatefulness of the system? The fact that in 1895 the admission rate per 1,000 in India rose to 522 has encouraged the grotesque statement that half the army in India is permanently in hospital through contagious disease. The average number in hospital is 45 per 1,000 (page 9, paragraph 11, recent Report). As to the suggested contrast (page 19) between British and foreign armies, (a) is it probable that “admissions to hospital” are as accurate an index to the real amount of disease in foreign armies? and (b) foreign armies are not quartered in India. The disease fluctuates oddly (Memo., p. 4, para. 8, Lucknow and Awampore). How is this to be explained? And is it true that the virulence of the disease has increased not only after, but because of, repeal? All that the statistics seem to show is that the old system of examination is no remedy,

and, therefore, that a remedy must be sought in some new direction.

“Equal Justice” in India. MR. ALFRED WEBB writes: Surely in such cases as the following—cases that too often meet one’s eye in Indian papers—should be more generally brought before British readers.

Calcutta, April 22.

Two apprentices in the Kanchrapara Railway workshop, by name Lawson and Collins, were charged before the Joint Magistrate of Ranaghat, who is a Bengalee gentleman, with assaulting two native women in a train, trespassing into the women’s car, riding on the foot-board, and false personation. It appears that on the 14th instant the accused got into an up-train without tickets. While the train was in motion, they examined the tickets of the passengers, pretending they were authorised ticket-inspectors. Between Chogdah and Ranaghat, Lawson entered the women’s car and Collins lowered the gas-light. Lawson assaulted the wife of an up-country pointsman and a widow with two children, who were the only occupants of the carriage. He tried to commit criminal assault upon the two women, who resisted him, while his friend watched from the foot-board. The train arrived at Ranaghat and the accused were arrested in a second-class bath-room where they had hidden themselves. The two women identified the accused, who admitted the charge. The Magistrate sentenced Lawson to one month’s rigorous imprisonment for assault, and a fine of Rs. 60 for false personation. Collins was fined Rs. 50 for false personation, travelling without a ticket and riding on the foot-boards while the train was in motion.—*Madras Standard*, April 23.

What can be more monstrously unfair than such magisterial action? It is difficult enough in India to convict whites of outrages on natives. Surely when convicted they should be sufficiently punished. Imagine what would be meted out to two apprentices for such outrages upon women in a railway train in the United Kingdom—in India but a month’s imprisonment and fines of some £3 15s. and £3 2s. ! If anything, punishments on whites in India for such crimes should be more severe than here. Do we not there assume to be the superior Christian race—standing as it were *in loco parentis* to the people—especially in relation to women and those who are weak and defenceless?

The Education of Hindu Girls. A RECENT Report of the Arya Girls’ School at Jalandhar contains an account of its work since it was opened in 1890, and marks a distinct advance in the education of Hindu girls. The school is a secondary one, unlike those which have been established by the State, or by missionary enterprise, and it aims at doing for the Hindu population of Jalandhar and its neighbourhood what the High Schools do for the Europeans and the Christians. At first some opposition was offered, but it has been successfully overcome, and the school has grown rapidly. The number of

scholars increased from 8 in 1890 to 104 in 1895, and among them are many married ladies, and some widows, of whom some are being trained as school-mistresses. Boarding-houses have been started for the benefit of pupils coming from a distance. The Ashram, which was opened in April, 1895, with only five girls, had increased its numbers to sixteen before the end of the year. By this means the usefulness of the school is greatly extended, and pupils have come from the Bombay Presidency, the North-Western Provinces, and Baluchistan. The course of instruction in the school includes physical exercises, hygiene, cookery, and music, as well as the ordinary subjects of reading, arithmetic, etc.; and, to judge from the many extracts from the school log-book given in the Report, the work is well taught:—

"The school promises to become a model in the Province, if its promoters continue the same interest in it as they have hitherto done, and the public does its share of duty towards such an institution. One of the special features of the school is that it commands influence outside the Jalandhar City; and several girls are now reading who have come from long distances, and they appear to me quite at home, and as much taken care of as they would be by their own people."

It would be difficult to exaggerate the benefit which ought to accrue from the higher education of Hindu women. Although it has been little attempted in the past, it is a scheme entirely consonant with the expressed opinions of the Vedic books, and should not, therefore, meet with opposition on religious grounds. It offers to Hindu women a possibility of releasing themselves from a life of excessive triviality, and of fitting themselves to work in the future for the good of their country and their fellows. The promoters of the school deserve great praise for the pioneer work they have done, and it is to be hoped that other cities will shortly follow the example of Jalandhar in supplying proper physical and mental training for their girls.

AMONG the English visitors to the last Congress was Mr. George Harwood, M.P., and he has since recorded his impressions in a newspaper article, from which we give some extracts on another page. Mr. Harwood's description will be read with some interest. It contains, as will be noticed, both light and shade. But when he abandons what may be termed the function of descriptive reporter and assumes the function of critic, he seems to be a little hampered partly by lack of information and partly, we must add, by a certain vein of subacidity. For example, he writes:—

"Short as has been my stay in India, it has been long enough to teach me what value should be put upon the words of the people; therefore I make little of the glowing eloquence," etc.

And again:—

"I ventured to suggest that one fault of all the proposed Resolutions was their verbosity, so that one could not see the wood for the trees."

"It is not the education of the juryman which is in question, but his justice and courage."

Similarly, Mr. Harwood appears to have embraced the "over-population" fallacy, while, as regards the proposed separation of judicial and executive duties, he thinks that

"the Congress might well address itself to the practical objections which are made to the change; such as that it would increase the expense of government and diminish its efficiency."

—just as if the Congress had not been addressing itself to these objections for the past ten years and more. Mr. Harwood is not, it would seem, acquainted with Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt's scheme. As for simultaneous examinations, Mr. Harwood observes that "no examiner has ever yet discovered a test for those qualities of character which have more to do than any knowledge with fitness to govern." No doubt. But that is an argument against examination as a test; it is not an argument for refusing in fact, while we promise on paper, to admit Indians equally with Englishmen to the test of examination. Mistakes like these—due, obviously, to nothing less remediable than imperfect knowledge—detract, of course, from the value of Mr. Harwood's article as a whole. But his descriptive passages are, as we have said, interesting, and he is perfectly accurate when he writes: "The Congress claims that its members come from different parts of the country, that they are in close touch with the masses of the people, and that therefore they are often likely to know more of the feelings of those people than is possible to European officials. All that they ask is to place this knowledge at the service of those officials, and that due weight should be given to it."

A Retiring
Civilian.

When a collector of customs indignantly throws up his employment, quotes poetry, talks about "the reward of" his "own conscience" and "the inward certainty that time will do" his "memory justice," and offers to take the Government and the public into his confidence "at this crisis," he runs the risk of provoking more smiles than tears in an unregenerate world. Does not Thackeray say of Jos Sedley that at a certain period in his life he fancied himself to be somehow or other mixed up with the public welfare? Mr. F. H. Skrine, whose farewell letter has attracted some notice in India, and is reproduced on another page, seems to be labouring under a similar theory. But when all necessary discount has been taken off his rather painful heroics, his letter remains an interesting and instructive account of the Indian Civil Service from the

other—that is, the disenchanted—side. The effect of the letter will not, perhaps, be quite what its author intended. It amounts rather to what the Germans call emptying out the baby with the bath. But when a disappointed worthy stands at the roadside and swears at large the discriminating listener may, after all, derive some advantage from his remarks. The *Indian Mirror*—one of the best of the Indian journals—says that Mr. Skrine's "denunciation is inspired more by envy than a sense of public duty." That is a severe judgment. But we confess that we should have attached more public importance to his criticisms if he had uttered them before deciding to resign. The truth seems to be that Mr. Skrine is not endowed with a lively sense of humour, else, for example, he could not have written "so complete is the absence nowadays of *esprit de corps* that one's successors rarely purchase any large proportion of one's household furniture." But, of course, that circumstance does not diminish the value of his observations upon drainage, technical education, and the Simla "exodus."

By the untimely death of Mr. Javerilal The late Mr. U. Yajnik, of which we received news Javerilal by telegram from the Bombay Presidency Association on May 8th, the Indian National Congress, and the people of India, have lost the services of a gifted, assiduous, and modest worker, whose place it will not be easy to fill. The British Committee of the Indian National Congress at their meeting on May 11th, adopted a resolution expressing their deepest regret at the sad news. They recognised in Mr. Javerilal "an untiring and devoted worker for the good of his countrymen, the loss of whose wise counsel and guidance will be felt by all friends of India." We have received the following brief memoir from one of Mr. Javerilal's Bombay friends who is at present in London:—

"Mr. Javerilal was a native of Nariad, in the Gujerat district. That town is only a few miles from the rich and prosperous city of Ahmedabad. As his surname indicates, he belonged to the caste of high Brahmins. Like many of his contemporaries he was educated at the Elphinstone Institution, that abiding monument which the people of Bombay raised in 1827 to the genius of Monnet Stuart Elphinstone. From his schooldays onwards Mr. Javerilal was known as a man of steady application, and great natural talents. He successfully passed from school to college. In 1858, he was one of the two first Dakshin fellows of Elphinstone College—his colleague being that distinguished Sanscrit scholar and social reformer, Professor Ramkrishna Gopal Bhausaekar. After finishing his academic career, Mr. Javerilal became a merchant. King Cotton ruled the day in Bombay during the American War of Independence (1861-5). Owing to the stoppage of all exports from the United States of cotton to Lancashire, Bombay was the chief market whence that manufacturing county derived its supply of the raw staple. Mr. Javerilal joined a firm which traded in cotton, and made large profits, only to lose

them later when the issue of the war was determined. But, though engaged in mercantile pursuits, Mr. Javerilal was not slow to employ his leisure hours in the study of burning financial and economic problems. Mr. Javerilal had from an early age a special aptitude for such subjects as taxation and land revenue, on which in later years he was able to speak and write with all the authority of an expert. The revision of revenue settlements had commenced in 1861 in the district of Kaira. Mr. Javerilal took the greatest interest in watching these surveys, and how the survey officers of the day assessed the different agricultural holdings of his native district. He had many opportunities of checking these official operations, and later there appeared a series of letters from his pen on the subject, which were afterwards collected in the form of an instructive brochure called 'Notes on Kaira.' These notes brought Mr. Javerilal into prominence, and greatly encouraged him to pursue his studies on the land revenue system of India, and specially of Bombay. Later, he became a member of the Bombay Municipal Corporation, and devoted himself with singular energy to a study of civic finance. So that when the beneficent scheme of Lord Ripon was introduced into the country in 1882, Mr. Javerilal was in an admirable position, from his personal knowledge and experience, to write a 'Note on Local Self-Government,' which could still be read with profit and instruction by those who desire to acquaint themselves with the early beginnings of self-government in the Bombay Presidency. His literary activity manifested itself in other ways. He was a constant contributor to the English and Native press; and it is to be hoped that his exertions will collect in permanent form the more valuable of these contributions. He was also a contributor to the pages of the *East India Association Journal*. There was one paper which at the time attracted great attention, namely, on the secret methods of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy in India. That paper deserves to be rescued from oblivion and placed before the rising generation of Indians. The last ten or fifteen years of his life were entirely devoted to public affairs. Wherever a public movement was to be set on foot Mr. Javerilal would be one of the first to be invited. He was a persistent friend of municipal progress, and many are the battles of municipal retrenchment he fought in the halls of the Corporation. For his many services in the Corporation, Mr. Javerilal was elected President of that body in 1892-3, an office in which he acquitted himself with his accustomed good sense, discretion and impartiality. In 1894 he was elected President of the Bombay Provincial Conference. He was also honorary Secretary of the Bombay branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. So few are the hard and persistent workers in the public life of Bombay that it is impossible not to recognise the gap which the death of Mr. Javerilal leaves. And none will more deeply feel the loss than the Bombay Municipal Corporation and the Bombay Presidency Association. As a member of the Bombay Legislative Council, too, Mr. Javerilal has left his mark. No member was more persistent in his interpellations on the land revenue settlements, and no member applied himself with greater industry or more accurate information to ascertain the exact truth from the Government. Needless to say, his interpellations led to beneficial changes in the department of land revenue and agriculture of which the outside public know little."

THE *Times* of April 27th contained a letter from Mr. J. P. Goodridge upon "British Iron Industries and Indian Ores." Mr. Goodridge invited attention to "the enormous and splendid accumulations of iron ore which occur in the metamorphic rocks of Chanda, in the Central Provinces of India." He added that "the present rules of the Government of India under which mining of any description can be carried on in India have discouraged rather than facilitated European enterprise."

CONCILIATION OR LITIGATION.

By S^r W. WOODSOM, Bart., M.P.

In support of my plea for a detailed village enquiry into the causes which have led to the ruin of the rayat, I have indicated, in previous articles, three directions in which those causes may be sought: the disorganisation of agricultural credit; the harsh and unsuitable methods of revenue collections; and the rack rents exacted by the Government. Many other causes, arising out of our centralised and unsympathetic system of administration, have contributed to blight the rayat's industry; but none more than that which I will notice to-day, I mean the establishment in our rural districts of debt courts on the European model. These courts were no doubt established with the best intentions, but in this respect they are only a type of the many blunders committed in our Indian administration from want of touch with the people, aggravated by our insular self-esteem, and absence of imagination, which makes us assume that what suits us must necessarily be beneficial to others. These debt courts, planted among the rural population, always remind me of Sydney Smith's rough joke about beef for the Hindus, and his ironical proposal to establish Government beef shops in all the villages of our Indian Empire: John Bull himself likes a beef steak; why then should not the Hindus also be similarly supplied, and thus share in the blessings of British rule?

The subject of these debt courts is a large one, and cannot be dealt with adequately within the limits of one article; so I will content myself with a brief exposition of the following propositions: (A), That the rayat cannot get on without the village money-lender, and that under the old native system the relations between the two classes were friendly and beneficial; (B), That by the introduction of debt courts upon the European model these friendly relations have been destroyed, and the rayat has been made the serf of the money-lender; and (C), That relief may be obtained by the revival and scientific development of the old system of conciliation and arbitration, by means of "Pancháyats," or village councils.

In order to illustrate these propositions in their order, we may take the case of the Bombay Deccan, partly because in those districts the chronic discord created by our civil courts broke out into open war, and partly because we possess in the five volumes which contain the Report of the Deccan Riots Commission a great body of facts collected on the spot by expert observers. We find, as regards (A), *the original relations of the two classes*, that the land is brought under cultivation by the joint action of the

rayat and the village "saukar" or money-lender. The established custom is that the saukar provides the seed-corn, and feeds the rayat and his family until the crop is ripe; making also cash advances to pay revenue instalments, buy bullocks, dig wells, and so forth. At harvest time a settlement is made, and the saukar receives a portion of the crop by way of payment for capital and interest. When therefore things work smoothly, the condition of the two classes may be regarded as a partnership founded on equity and mutual advantage; each taking a share of the crop which is produced by the industry of the one and the self-restraint of the other. To quote the words of Sir George Wingate, the father of the Bombay Revenue system, "the village money-lender and the rayat worked together in harmony, and both alike shared prosperity and adversity together." That this is the rayat's view of the natural order of things is amply shown by the evidence taken before the Commission. Thus one writer describes how he appealed for mercy to his creditor on the ground of this natural tie, and besought him saying: "You are my mother and I am your son." And in truth the parable is not inapt. For the saukar's advances are to the rayat as mother's milk. He cannot live without them. And all that he asks is to be treated with parental kindness and forbearance. This view, which recognises the mutual dependence of the two classes, and regards conciliation as the only hope of future prosperity, was urged by Mr. Shambhuprasád, a very experienced Native member of the Commission, who summarised his conclusions as follows:—

"The rayats cannot do without the saukars: they must have some people to borrow from, and Government cannot undertake the business of the saukars. No measures should therefore be taken that may disturb the amicable relation between the saukars and the rayats."

And the same view was strongly insisted on by the speakers in the great debate in the Viceroy's Council at Simla in 1879, on the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act; Sir John Strachey pointing out that "money-lenders are obviously as necessary to the Indian agriculturist as the seed which he sows, or as the rain which falls from heaven to water his fields."

Such being the natural friendly relations between the rayat and the village money-lender, we have next to enquire (B) *how those relations were broken up, and a condition of the bitterest antagonism produced*. The answer is perfectly simple. The change was produced by the introduction of our debt courts on the European model, which made the money-lender absolute master of the situation, arming him with the whole power of the Empire in the recovery of his debts. Under the easy-going Native régime, which exercised little coercion in such matters, the creditor had to cultivate the good-

will of his debtor, and to rely upon the local public opinion as regards the justice of his demand. He was one among many, and could not afford to outrage the general sentiment of the village in which he dwelt. Although therefore the nominal rate of interest was high, being equivalent to 12, 24, and 36 per cent. per annum, according to the rayat's credit, the actual recovery depended very much upon the result of the harvest, and the rayat's ability to pay. An appeal to the authorities practically referred him back to local public opinion. For among the Mahrattas the Pancháyat or Court of Arbitration was the main instrument for the administration of justice, and it was only in extreme cases that the creditor could reckon upon the coercive help of a decree from a stipendiary judge. But all this was changed by the introduction of our debt courts, governed by technical rules of procedure,—rigid, merciless, and irresistible. The high nominal rates of interest became a terrible reality when embodied in a mortgage bond. And armed with a decree for foreclosure and sale, the creditor could either evict the rayat from his ancestral acres, or keep him on the land as a tenant-at-will on a rack rent, reducing him to the lowest depths of serfdom. The angry despair which fills the hearts of the whole peasantry has from time to time shown itself in agrarian outbreaks, but none the less destructive are the results where the struggle goes on silently, oppression on one side, with evasion and fraud on the other. Volumes of reports have been filled with the tale of the rayat's woes, brought about by our imprudent and revolutionary changes, which have upset and broken up the whole framework of the rural economy. But the fruits of our innovation cannot be better described than in the words of Sir George Wingate:—

"This miserable struggle between debtor and creditor is thoroughly debasing to both. The creditor is made by it a grasping hard-hearted oppressor; the debtor a crouching false-hearted slave. It is disheartening to contemplate, and yet it would be weakness to conceal the fact that this antagonism of classes and degradation of the people, which is fast spreading over the land, is the work of our laws and our rule."

If such be the results of antagonism why not try conciliation? Why not revert to the method which produced "mutual confidence and mutual goodwill"? And this brings us to our last proposition (C), that relief may be obtained by the revival and scientific development of the old system of conciliation and arbitration by means of "Pancháyats" or Village Councils. Mr. Mountstuart Elphinstone, the most distinguished Governor which Bombay ever possessed, was very strongly in favour of the Pancháyat system, and bears testimony to its popularity, quoting in proof the current phrase "Panch Parameswara," an Eastern rendering of the maxim

Vox populi, vox Dei. In another place he says:—"Too much pains cannot be taken to encourage private arbitration." And in his celebrated report on the Deccan he has given a full description of its excellent working under Rám Shástri and the great Minister Náná Farnavis, together with his own views as to its continuance under British rule. Sir Thomas Munro, Sir John Malcolm, and other eminent statesmen of a past generation shared in this view, and expressed opinions strongly in favour of reviving this national institution. Indian public opinion at the present day is solid in the same direction. When I was in India this feeling took a very practical shape in the Bombay Presidency. For the people of their own accord set up voluntary arbitration tribunals under the name of "Lawád" Courts, as a means of avoiding the mischiefs arising out of litigation. The following extract from a Native paper gives a brief account of what was done:—

"The movement for the establishment of private Arbitration Courts commenced about two years ago in the small Talooka town of Indapur in the Poona District. The want of such Courts was so generally felt, and the existing law was so favourable to their establishment that in two years private Arbitration Courts have been established in the Zilla towns of Poona, Sattara, Sholapur, Ahmednagar, Tauna, Ratnagiri, Nasick, Ahmedabad; and in the Poona, Sholapur, Sattara, and Tanna Districts, branch Courts have been established in the Talooka towns of Indapur, Supe, Karmale, Saswad, Talegaum, Kheda, Junnar, Kerjut, Kalian, and Wai. The Poona Arbitration Court commenced its work in January, 1876. At a public meeting of the inhabitants of Poona, a Committee of eighty-two gentlemen, representing all classes of the population, was appointed as a board of judges. Private suitors are allowed to choose any one or more out of this number to arbitrate upon matters referred to them. The Arbitrators sit by rotation, and get no remuneration for their voluntary labours. Nearly 3,000 suits during the last two years have been disposed of by private settlement in the Poona Arbitration Court."

This public-spirited and patriotic movement interested me much. As a District Judge in the Deccan I had painful experience of the evils attaching to the existing system, and I was anxious to secure regularity and permanence to these voluntary arbitration tribunals, by bringing them into our judicial system. Accordingly, in consultation with experienced friends, I worked out a scheme to effect this purpose. The position was as follows: side by side there existed at this time two methods of settling disputes, one by conciliation, that is by friendly Pancháyat; the other by antagonism, that is by hostile suit in court. Each had its merits, and the idea was to combine the merits of both. On the one hand we had a strong staff of Native Subordinate Judges, trustworthy and highly trained, and accustomed to punctual discharge of business, but who, from their English education and isolated

position found it difficult to learn the real merits of each case, and were often imperfectly informed regarding the condition and feelings of the people. Also in hearing cases they were cramped by the technicalities regarding evidence and procedure. On the other hand we had the local Pancháyats, capable of thoroughly ascertaining the facts of each case, their defects being dilatoriness, with the possibility of being swayed by feelings of partiality. The proposal was to combine the two, and obtain the excellences of both: the exact information of the Pancháyat, controlled by the business habits and impartiality of the Judge. The plan for carrying out this object was based upon the old Mahratta system, according to which a dispute never came before a Judge until every form of Pancháyat had been tried and had failed. I proposed that each large village or group of smaller villages should have its recognised Pancháyat, the list of members being approved and published by the Government, and that before this Judicial Committee of the Village Council all claims for small debts should in the first instance be brought. As many cases as possible would be disposed of amicably, the remainder being reserved till the Subordinate Judge, coming periodically on tour, arrived at the village, when he would sit as "Sir-Panch" or President of the Pancháyat, and with their assistance dispose finally of all disputed points. As the members of the Pancháyat ask for no remuneration, no fee would be charged on cases settled amicably, or at most something trifling to cover petty contingencies. The usual Court fee would be charged if either of the parties invoked the aid of the Subordinate Judge, whether in the decision or in the execution of the award. This payment would discourage frivolous objections to the award of the Pancháyat, but would not deter a plaintiff or defendant from reserving his case if he had reasonable ground to fear injustice on account of local feelings of enmity or partiality. In no case should an appeal be allowed, for in these small debt suits a point of law rarely occurs, and when it does the Subordinate Judge is quite competent to deal with it. To guard against anything like a series of mistaken judgments we might trust to the supervision of the District Judge and his Assistants, who would travel about, questioning the people and hearing their complaints, inspecting the records, supervising and encouraging the Pancháyats, and using their influence to heal village feuds and maintain friendly relations among all classes. A system of this sort was recommended in the Deccan Riots Reports, and resembles the plan allowed by the Madras Regulation on Arbitration which was I believe drafted under the instructions of Sir Thomas Munro.

The next step was to obtain the opinion of

practical men, both those who have to administer the law, and also the classes specially interested. Accordingly a Bill was framed, and submitted to a large and representative public meeting in the Town Hall at Poona on the 4th of May, 1879. The general principles were approved, and the Bill was referred to an influential Select Committee chosen by the meeting. This Committee consisted of seven Subordinate Judges, two retired Subordinate Judges, two retired Revenue Officers, three Pleaders, two Bankers, and one editor; all practical men deeply interested in the welfare of the rural population. I have now before me their report, which was adopted unanimously, together with the Bill as amended. The preamble runs as follows:—

"Whereas with a view to bring about conciliation and promote friendly feelings between the money lenders and agricultural classes; and to diminish the expense of litigation and to render the principal and more intelligent and respectable inhabitants useful by employing them in administering justice to their neighbours, it is desirable that suits against agriculturists should be disposed of by Pancháyats, it is enacted as follows."

And to this preamble there followed the twenty clauses of the Bill providing in detail for the requirements of the case. In accordance with the request of the Committee I forwarded this draft Bill¹ for the favourable consideration of Government.

It was said of William the Silent that:

"He would do and ordain nothing except by the advice of the estates, by reason that they were best acquainted with the circumstances and humours of the inhabitants."

Unfortunately our Indian Government follows other and less wise counsels those of the great Stadtholder. So this practical scheme for the benefit of the rayats came to nought. The popular movement was discountenanced by the authorities; the stamp duty upon Arbitration Awards was increased; and each of the Subordinate Judges who had taken part in the scheme was separately reprimanded. I give this as another instance of grievous mischief caused to the rayat by Government measures, and of the refusal of the Government either itself to remedy the evil, or to allow others to do so.

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

I.—BY ALFRED WEBB.²

Sometime President of the Indian National Congress.

IN the early fifties there may have been some excuse for the people of the United Kingdom considering themselves before the rest of the world in some respects. They prided themselves especially on their humanity. They appeared to have fully adopted the principles of free trade. They had

¹ The text of the Bill will be published in the next issue of INDIA.

² This article is reproduced, by kind permission of the author, from the *New York Nation* of May 6th.

abolished slavery in their colonies. They believed they had extended to the farthest confines of the empire those principles of freedom and equality under which, in Curran's time, on British soil alone the slave stood "redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation." The empire had extended widely over the globe. It was free to every nationality, and within its confines was known no distinction, "Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free." In all these respects we were inclined to consider ourselves innately superior to other peoples, guided by clearer reason, impelled by loftier motives.

The experiences of subsequent years have, however, tended considerably to modify our self-satisfaction. Subjected to the same tests, placed in similar circumstances, we have fallen short like other mortals. Our apparent superiority lay not within our own natures, but in our circumstances, and those of our own people, who had sought homes abroad under our flag. Under the stress of the Indian mutiny and the Jamaica rebellion, we developed a brutality as great as was ever shown by a civilised people, and which men of the highest culture attempted to justify. We defied ordinary canons of warfare as much as did Napoleon on his retreat from Syria. When the War of the Rebellion broke out, it was soon manifest how little British theoretical ideas concerning liberty prevailed as against aristocratic prejudices and supposed material interests. As our colonies were conceded self-government and came under democratic influences, they adopted protectionist principles. We censured the Chinese immigration restriction laws of California; but Australia and New Zealand, when the shoe pinched, followed suit with regulations as exclusive. The New Zealand Maoris, those that were left, fought their way to respect, but elsewhere in our colonies has developed colour prejudice as marked in proportion to the exigencies of the situation as in your Southern States.

Equal laws concerning the rights of citizens in all portions of the empire—more especially in India—still subsisted. Whatever the attitude of our colonists towards coloured foreigners, the rights of British-born subjects, of whatever race, stood intact. In the Queen's proclamation after the Mutiny, confirmed by Viceroy's upon numerous occasions, the Indian people were supposed to possess guarantees for equal treatment as inviolable as the provisions of Magna Charta.

"We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects; and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil."

The letter and spirit of this proclamation have been set at naught by recent doings in South Africa, flagrantly in contravention of the theory of an empire guaranteeing equal rights and immunities to all subjects. The question has aroused widespread indignation in India, especially among those classes whose contentment with the general policy of the empire is essential to the peace of the country.

The population of India increases rapidly and encroaches upon the means of subsistence. South Africa is the nearest outlet for emigration. The climate is congenial; and thither numbers of Indians have repaired—educated Parsees and other merchants to trade; men of the middle class as shopkeepers and clerks; coolies and hosts of the humbler classes as labourers—perhaps 100,000 altogether. While all were at first welcomed as helpful towards the development of the country, all alike have been subjected to disabilities by colour prejudice and by law. The subject was treated at the Indian National Congress of 1894. "Papers relating to the grievances of H.M. Indian subjects in the South African Republic (The Transvaal)" were presented to Parliament in September, 1895. Concerning wrongs in Natal, forty of the principal Indian residents there memorialised Mr. Chamberlain in February, 1896. Later, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, a Hindu barrister, long resident in South Africa, returned to India to arouse public interest in the subject. His address at Bombay, last September, has been published; also the memorial to Lord George Hamilton, from the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta, C.I.E., chairman of one of the meetings, which he addressed. Mr. Gandhi says:

"The general feeling throughout South Africa is that of hatred towards the Indians, encouraged by the newspapers and countenanced, by the legislators. Every Indian without exception is a coolie in the estimation of the general body of the Europeans. . . . Naturally neither the traders nor the English-educated Indians are treated with any degree of respect. Wealth and abilities in an Indian count for naught in that country except to serve the interests of the European colonists. . . . In most parts of South Africa we may not stir out of our houses after 9 p.m. unless we are armed with passes from our employers. . . . Hotels shut their doors against us. We cannot make use of the tramcars unmolested. . . . Public baths are not for the Indians. The high schools are not open for the Indians. . . . Even the primary schools are not quite open to the Indians. An Indian missionary schoolmaster was driven out of an English church in Verulam, a small village in Natal. . . . Such is the general feeling against the Indian in South Africa, except the Portuguese territories, where he is respected and has no grievance apart from the general population. You can easily imagine how difficult it must be for a respectable Indian to exist in such a country. . . . Ours is one continued struggle against degradation sought to be inflicted upon us by the Europeans, who desire to degrade us to the level of a raw Kafir."

"Except the Portuguese territories, where he is respected and has no grievance apart from the general population"—how little cause has Protestantism to vaunt its humanity as superior to that of Catholicism, where prejudices or interests supervene!

The South African States in which the general treatment of British Indian subjects is above described, are (1) those independent of British control (such as the Orange Free State); (2) those under British suzerainty (the Transvaal); (3) those under British protection (Zanzibar); (4) independent colonies (the Cape and Natal); with (5) a Crown colony (Zutoland).

Concerning the treatment of Indians in the Orange Free State, the United Kingdom has no direct responsibility and control. It could protest, as did the Italian Government regarding the number of Italians in New Orleans. This it has not done, as it

would concerning like treatment of white citizens. The Transvaal was conceded independence under what is known as the "London Convention." "All persons other than natives, conforming themselves to the laws" were guaranteed full liberty of ingress, residence, and egress, the right to "hire or possess houses, manufactories, warehouses, shops," and to "carry on their commerce, either in person or by any agents whom they may think fit to employ." The dissatisfaction of British Indian natives at the manner in which these provisions were ignored regarding them was such that in 1895 the British Government referred the case as between it and the Transvaal in this matter to the arbitrament of the Chief Justice of the Orange Free State. He decided in favour of the Transvaal largely upon the ground that Lord Derby, Secretary of State in 1855, gave "an assurance that Her Majesty's Government will not desire to insist upon any such construction of the terms of the Convention as would interfere with reasonable legislation" to discourage the "general influx of foreign coloured natives." Thus, while English sentiment now appears inclined to justify a raid on a friendly State because British white citizens are delayed in their attainment of political rights, it makes no complaint, though British coloured citizens are debarred from ever acquiring citizenship or property, are permitted to settle temporarily only upon registry and payment of a fee of £25, and, when settled, must inhabit only special streets, wards, and locations, are debarred the use of the sidewalks, and restricted on railways to the third class.

In the recent disturbances in Zanzibar, under British protection, while, say Indian memorialists, "Her Majesty's European subjects were given the opportunity of going to the consulate and on board the English ship for protection, and their localities guarded by troops of police, no provision was at all made for us." They were robbed of their property, and some of them killed. The Cape has passed laws agreed to by the Home Government, authorising a municipality to frame by-laws prohibiting Indians from the use of sidewalks, and restricting them to specified localities. In Natal, Mr. Chamberlain has given the royal assent to an act excluding from the franchise British subjects not born in countries possessing parliamentary institutions. This excludes, and was meant to exclude, British Indians. An "Immigration Law Amendment Bill" is now under consideration by which Indian immigrant labourers must serve under a five years' indenture, must pay an annual poll-tax of £3 (equivalent to six months' wages) or leave the country. Laws in force prevent Indians from being out of their houses after nine p.m. without a pass, and from driving cattle without a pass. In Zululand, a Crown colony, under the control of the Home Office through the Governor of Natal, in recent sales of land only persons of European birth or descent have been permitted to purchase; and then under an agreement that if at any time purchasers or their representatives or heirs permit such land to be occupied otherwise than by persons of European birth or descent, it will revert to the Crown.

These varied disabilities, sufferings, and wrongs

have been most strikingly forced upon public attention, both in India and at home, by Mr. Gandhi during his mission to his native country. In the treatment meted out to him on his return to Natal, at the hands of the people whose conduct towards his countrymen he had exposed, we are reminded of early abolition days in the United States. When his steamer was signalled, a crowd of indignant whites collected, who mobbed him, upon his landing, with stones and beating. At length, rescued and taken to a friend's house, stones and other missiles were thrown against it, while "several stump speeches were made."

Neither great branch of the English-speaking family can, in truth, plume itself upon its peculiar innate virtues or immunity from failings. At the same time, the Constitution of the United States, with equal laws (broken or outraged, it is true, by sectional prejudices), would appear likely more rapidly to tend towards equal liberty and equal rights than the Constitution of the British Empire, under which imperial prejudices and differences of rights and immunities are sanctioned by unequal laws.

II.—By G. K. GOKHALE,

Professor of History and Political Economy, Fergusson College, Poona.

The memorial which the British Indians in Natal have recently submitted to Mr. Chamberlain unfolds a tale which no Indian can read without bitterness, and no right-minded Englishman ought to read without a feeling of deep shame and indignation. We all know how Wordsworth, in one of his sonnets, recalls that a Roman master once stood on Grecian ground and to the people assembled there proclaimed the liberty of Greece, and that the proclamation filled the fallen Greeks with wild delight. And we know with what severe dignity the poet reproves the folly of the Greeks in imagining that liberty could thus be bestowed by one nation on another as a gift. Not all the blended powers of earth and heaven can do that, he exclaims. It must be acquired by a people for itself, and deserved before it can be acquired. If this is true of Liberty, I believe it is even more true of that other moral principle which occupied with Liberty so prominent a place in the early creed of the French Revolution—Equality. If Statutes and Proclamations—the spontaneous gifts of Parliaments and Sovereigns—could place a subject people on a footing of equality with their conquerors, the people of India had occupied a proud, a glorious position indeed to-day. For more than sixty years, this delusion of equality has been kept up, and it has beguiled many of us to live in that paradise which the wise man avoids. I do not pretend that even during all this time, this equality has been anything more than mere paper-equality, if such an expression may be allowed, or that prevarication and subterfuge have not been used by the representatives of the ruling race to get out of the obligations imposed upon them by their promises and declarations. But, the very fact of their resorting to such means clearly indicated the moral strength of our position, and left us ground for hoping that in course of time we might so appeal

to the conscience of Englishmen that their sense of honour would triumph over their selfishness, and that we might at last have that justice done to us which, though long delayed, had never been irrevocably denied. The Englishmen of Natal, however, seem anxious to give us a rough shaking, and wake us to a truer, though more disagreeable, sense of the situation. And by a curious irony of fate, the year of the Diamond Jubilee of Her Gracious Majesty's reign is selected to bring home forcibly to our minds the fact that, after all, we are only British slaves, and not British subjects, and that it is idle on our part to expect justice or fair treatment where it does not suit the interests of Englishmen to be just or fair.

At the beginning of this century, England strove nobly for the emancipation of the slaves. Who would have thought that in the closing years of this self-same century, some of her children would endeavour to proclaim the doom of practical slavery for three hundred millions of people under her own flag—for one-sixth of the whole human race—and that she would quietly look on while this outrage was perpetrated in her name!

The Government of India has always been prompt in giving adequate protection to its English subjects, in whatever quarter of the globe they may need it. Will it not raise even a feeble protest, when the members of a British colony insult its Indian subjects in the most shameful manner, say that they are only black vermin and not men, that they can live on the smell of an oily rag, that they breed like rabbits, and that it was a pity that they could not be shot down, and so forth, and so forth? The bitter mockery of the assertion that we are British subjects, or that we have a Government to look after our interests, was never made plainer than by this Natal business.

The numerous disabilities, which have been imposed on the Indians in South Africa by men who are among the foremost in their denunciation of President Kruger for his treatment of the Uitlanders, have often been set forth and discussed in the pages of this journal, and I have no wish to enter into them on this occasion. My purpose in writing this paper is merely to call pointed attention to the leading facts connected with the anti-Indian demonstration that took place in Natal on 13th January, 1897, which was intended to prevent the landing of certain Indian passengers on board the SS. "Courland" and SS. "Naderi," and which culminated in a cowardly and disgraceful attempt to lynch a highly-cultured and respected Indian gentleman—an attempt that still goes unpunished. These facts are few, but they will not fail to convey to the Indian mind a lesson and a warning which will not be easily forgotten.

In August, 1896, a certain Sugar Company in Natal applied to the Immigration Trust Board, indenting for a certain number of skilled Indian labourers. The Board granted the application. As soon, however, as the information was published in the newspapers, a violent storm of indignation arose in the colony, and an agitation against the influx of any more Indians was set on foot. As a result, the sugar company grew apprehensive and withdrew its

application; but that failed to satisfy the agitators, who now wanted to rid the colony of Indians altogether. While the public mind was thus excited, a press telegram to the following effect was despatched by Reuter's Agency in Bombay to Natal:

"A pamphlet published in India declares that the Indians in Natal are robbed and assaulted and treated like beasts, and are unable to obtain redress. The *Times of India* advocates an inquiry into these allegations."

We all know that Reuter is no friend to India. But there are limits to misrepresentation beyond which even he is expected not to go. The result of his mischievous telegram was naturally to add fuel to the fire. The pamphlet was a statement of the grievances of the British Indians in South Africa by Mr. M. K. Gandhi, who had been deputed by the Indians in Natal to represent to their countrymen in India the grievances from which they suffered, and to secure the co-operation of Indian authorities and Indian public bodies in their struggle for their redress. That there was nothing in this pamphlet to justify Reuter's description of its contents became abundantly clear to every fair-minded man in Natal when copies of the pamphlet itself arrived there. But, meanwhile, the mischief had been already done. The two leading newspapers of Natal—the *Natal Mercury* and the *Natal Advertiser*—thus expressed themselves on the point. Said the *Mercury*:

"Mr. Gandhi on his part, and on behalf of his countrymen, has done nothing that he is not entitled to do, and from his point of view the principle that he is working for is an honourable and legitimate one. He is within his rights, and, so long as he acts honestly and in a straightforward manner, he cannot be blamed or interfered with. So far as we know, he has always done so, and his latest pamphlet we cannot honestly say is an unfair statement of the case, from his point of view. Reuter's cable is a gross exaggeration of Mr. Gandhi's statement. He enumerates only a number of grievances, but these by no means justify anyone in stating that his pamphlet declares that the Indians in Natal are robbed and assaulted and treated like beasts, and are unable to obtain redress."

The *Advertiser* wrote:

"A perusal of Mr. Gandhi's pamphlet, recently published in Bombay, leads to the conclusion that the telegraphic description of its objects and contents was considerably exaggerated. True, Mr. Gandhi complains of a certain amount of ill-treatment of indentured Indians, but there is nothing to warrant the statement that he alleges that the Indians in Natal are robbed, assaulted, and treated like beasts. His is rather the old familiar grievance that the Indian is regarded and treated by Europeans as belonging to a separate class and race, and not one of themselves. From Mr. Gandhi's point of view this is very deplorable, and it is easy to sympathise with him and his compatriots."

But, while this change of opinion was slow in coming, and even when it came, affected only the thoughtful few in Natal, the organisers of the anti-Indian agitation were doing their best to take advantage of Reuter's misrepresentation and rouse the worst feelings of many of the colonists against the Indian settlers. On 18th September, 1896, an Association, called the European Patriotic Association, was formed in Maritzburg, the object of which was the practical exclusion of the Indians from the Colony. Two months later, another Association for the same object was established in Durban, called the Colonial Patriotic Association. This Association drew up and circulated for signatures a petition, libelling and maligning the Indians as persons

whose presence in the colony was harmful to the best interests of British supremacy in South Africa. While the popular mind was thus in a high state of ferment, on 18th December arrived at Durban the two ill-fated ships mentioned above, viz., the "Courland" and the "Naderi," with about 600 Indians on board, one of them being Mr. Gandhi. This was a signal for the agitators to lose their heads completely, and then the colony entered upon a course of conduct of which its thoughtful members are already ashamed. The agitators decided to prevent the Indian passengers from landing at all costs, and the Natal Government so far forgot its duty and its dignity that it lent a more or less open countenance to the proceedings of the mob. The steamers had an absolutely clean bill of health during the voyage, and yet the Health Officer directed that they should be in quarantine until twenty-three days had elapsed since leaving Bombay. On the next day a proclamation appeared in the *Government Gazette Extraordinary*, declaring Bombay to be an infected port. But, after all, this twenty-three days' quarantine did not mean much, as the steamers had already taken eighteen days between Bombay and Durban, and the Durban mob therefore thought that the Health Officer had treated the Indian vessels indulgently. He was accordingly suspended, and one Dr. Birtwell was put in his place. As soon as the twenty-three days from Bombay were over, the ships claimed pratique, but, instead of granting that, Dr. Birtwell and a Superintendent of Police boarded the ships, examined the passengers and crew, gave instructions as to disinfection, fumigation, and burning of soiled clothes, mats, baskets, and other articles, and imposed a further quarantine of twelve days. This happened on 24th December. On the 29th, Dr. Birtwell again visited the vessels, and expressed himself satisfied with the work of disinfection and fumigation already carried out, but at the same time extended the period of quarantine to twelve days from the 29th December. The masters of the two vessels made urgent representations to Government that as the clothes, bedding, etc., of the passengers had been destroyed under its order, it should supply new blankets to the poor people, as they suffered greatly from wet and cold. No notice whatsoever was taken of these representations. In fact, if the Natal Government had been anxious that there should be an outbreak of sickness on board the ships, it could not have taken more effective steps to secure that object. What the Government would not do was, however, done by the Indian residents in Durban, who started a Quarantine Relief Fund, whereby blankets were supplied to all the passengers on both the ships, as also food-stuffs to poor passengers free of charge, involving altogether an expense of about £125.

The masters of the ships did everything in their power to protest against the barbarous treatment to which their passengers were subjected, and the loss which had been inflicted on themselves. Government, however, paid absolutely no heed to their remonstrances. At last, on 12th January, they sent the following ultimatum to Government:—

"The steamers have now been at the outer anchorage for twenty-four days, at a cost of £150 per diem to us; and this

being so, you will see the reasonableness of your giving us a full answer by noon to-morrow. And we think it right to inform you that failing a definite reply giving us an assurance that we shall be paid £150 per diem from Sunday last, and that you are taking steps to suppress the rioters, so as to enable us to disembark the steamers, preparations will be at once commenced to steam into the harbour, relying on the protection which, we respectfully submit, Government is bound to give us."

The ultimatum proved effective, and elicited the following reply on the 13th January:—

"The port captain has been instructed that the steamers shall be ready to cross the bar inwards at 12 o'clock to-day. The Government needs no reminder of its responsibility for the maintenance of order."

The dignity of the Government was offended, but a definite answer was at last secured.

But, while the Government of Natal was inflicting what hardships it could on the Indian passengers by abusing its powers in the matter of imposing quarantine, the mob of Durban was not idle. The following notice appeared in the *Natal Advertiser* on the 30th December over the signature of "Harry Sparks, Chairman of Preliminary Meeting," one of her Majesty's commissioned officers:—

"Wanted every man in Durban to attend a meeting to be held in the large room in the Victoria Café, on Monday, the 4th January, at 8 o'clock, for the purpose of arranging a demonstration to proceed to the Point to protest against the landing of Asiatics."

At the meeting held accordingly, about two thousand persons bound themselves to do what they could to prevent the landing of the Indian passengers. The speeches delivered were worthy of the agitation. One passage may be quoted here as a sample. Dr. Mackenzie said in the course of his speech:—

"Mr. Gandhi,—(prolonged hissing and hooting)—that gentleman came to Natal and settled in the borough of Durban. He was received here freely and openly; all the privileges and advantages which the Colony could afford him were at his disposal. No contracting or circumscribing influence was brought to play upon him any more than on the audience or himself (the speaker), and he had all the privileges of their hospitality. In return, Mr. Gandhi had accused the Colonists of Natal of having dealt unfairly with Indians, and of having abused and robbed and swindled them. (A voice, 'You can't swindle a coolie.') He (the doctor) quite agreed with that. Mr. Gandhi had returned to India and dragged them in the gutters, and painted them as black and filthy as his own skin. (Applause.) And this was what they might call in Indian parlance an honourable and manly return for the privileges which Natal had allowed him. . . . It was the intention of these facile and delicate creatures to make themselves proprietors of the only thing that the rulers of this country had withheld from them—the franchise. It was their intention to put themselves in parliament and legislate for the Europeans; to take over the household management, and put the Europeans in the kitchen. . . . Their country had decided that they had enough Asiatics and Indians here, and they were going to treat them fairly and well, provided they behaved themselves; but if they were going to associate themselves with such men as Gandhi, and abuse their hospitality, and act in the way he had done, they might expect the same kind of treatment that was to be meted out to him. (Applause.) However great a misfortune it might be for those people, he could not get over the distinction between black and white."

The resolutions passed at the meeting were communicated to Government, who wrote back in reply:

"I am to state that the closest attention has been, is being, and will be given to this question, the extreme importance of which the Government most completely recognises. Government is in full sympathy with the consensus of public opinion

in this Colony as regards the desirability of preventing the over-running of the Colony by the Asiatics."

Another meeting of a similar character was held on the 7th January, and finally it was resolved to go to the Point to "receive" the Indian passengers and tell them that they were not wanted in the colony. The mob present at the meeting promised that "when they got to the Point, they would put themselves under their leader, and do exactly what he told them, if he told them to do anything." Meanwhile, to intimidate the passengers, a letter was written to them by Captain Sparks, "to acquaint them with the state of feeling in the Colony," and they were told that, if they attempted to land, they would run great risk of personal injury. A similar intimation was conveyed by Government to the masters of the two vessels, but happily the passengers remained firm, and thus on the 13th January the two steamers got ready for disembarking.

The scene at the landing, and some incidents connected with it cannot be better described than in the language of the memorial itself:—

"Long before the owners were informed that the ships were to be brought in that day, the town knew it. The bugles to rally were sounded at 10.30 a.m., the shopkeepers put up their shutters, and people began to flock to the Point. The following is an account of the muster at the Point, taken from the *Natal Advertiser*. 'Shortly before 12 o'clock the muster on Alexander Square was completed, and, as far as could be ascertained, the sections were as follows:—Railway men, 100 to 1,000—Wylie, leader; assistants: G. Whelan, W. Coles, Grant, Erlmont, Dick, Duke, Russell, Calder, Titheridge. Yacht Club, Point Club, and Rowing Club, 150—Mr. Dan Taylor, leader; assistants: Messrs. Anderton, Goldsbury, Hutton, Harper, Murray Smith, Johnston, Wood, Peters, Anderson, Crose, Playfair, Seaward. Carpenters and joiners, 450—Puntan, leader; assistants: H. W. Nichols, Jam. Hood, T. G. Harper. Printers, 80—Mr. R. D. Sykes, leader; assistants: W. P. Plowman, E. Edwards, J. Shackleton, E. Trulley, T. Armstrong. Shop assistants, about 400—Mr. A. A. Gibson, J. McIntosh, leaders; assistants: Messrs. H. Pearson, W. H. Kinsman, J. Pardy, Dawson, S. Adams, A. Mummery, J. Tyzack, Johns, J. Ripson, Banfield, Etheridge. Austin. Tailors and Saddlers, 70—J. C. Armitage, leader; assistants: H. Mullholland, G. Bull, R. Godfrey, E. Mander-son, A. Rose, J. W. Dent, C. Dowse. Plasterers and Brick-layers, 200—Dr. McKenzie, leader; assistants: Horner, Keal, Brown, Jenkinson. Pointmen, a small section—J. Dick, leader; assistants: Gimber, Clackston, Poyson, Elliott, Parr. General public, about 1,000—T. Adams, leader; assistants: Franklin, A. F. Garbutt, G. W. Young, Somers, P. F. Garbutt, Downard. Native section, 500—Mr. G. Spradbrow and Mr. R. C. Vincent organised the natives, and kept them in order on Alexandra Square, while the Demonstration was going on. They told the natives they had appointed a dwarf native as their leader. They were highly amused with this diminutive chap, who marched up and down in front of their ranks officiating them, while they went through a number of exercises with their sticks, and danced and whooped. This proved an excellent diversion to keep the natives out of trouble. Later on Supt. Alexander appeared on horseback and moved them off the square.

"As the 'Courland' entered the bay all eyes were on the look-out to see what form the demonstration was taking. A row of people, extending from the south end of the main wharf to some distance along the north pier, could be perceived, but they seemed to take matters very calmly. The Indians on board did not seem much scared, and Mr. Gandhi and a few others who were on deck looked on with an unperturbed expression. The main body of the demonstrators, who had thronged the vessels at the main wharf, could not be seen from the incoming steamers. The surprise experienced by those on the embankment when they saw the 'Courland' laid alongside the Bluff Channel moorings, was seen by their actions. They were seen to rush hither and thither, entirely

at a loss how to proceed, and soon they all left to attend the meeting on Alexander Square. This was the last that the vessels were to see of the much-talked-of demonstration. The passengers landed in small batches in ferry boats, about two hours after the crowd had dispersed. As for Mr. Gandhi, the Superintendent of Water Police was instructed by Mr. Escombe to offer to land him and his family quietly at night that day. Mr. Gandhi accepted the offer with thanks. Later on the same day Mr. Laughton paid him a friendly visit on board, and suggested that they should land together. The suggestion was accepted, and on his own responsibility, at his own risk, and without previously informing the Water Police, landed near Addington with Mr. Laughton at about 5 o'clock. He was recognised by some boys, who followed him and his companion, and as they were proceeding along West Street, the main street of Durban, the crowd became large. Mr. Laughton was separated from him; Mr. Gandhi was kicked, whipped, stale fish and other missiles were thrown at him, which hurt his eye and cut his ear, and his hat was taken off his head. While this was going on, the wife of the Superintendent of Police, who happened to be passing by, bravely afforded protection with her umbrella, and the police, on hearing the yells and the cries, came to the rescue, and escorted him safely to an Indian house. But the crowd, which had by this time become very large, did not leave, and, blockading the front of the house, demanded 'Gandhi.' As darkness deepened the crowd continued to swell. The Superintendent of Police, fearing serious disturbance, and forcible entry into the house, had Mr. Gandhi removed to the Police Station disguised as a police constable."

That the affair of this demonstration has filled sober Englishmen, even in Natal, with pain and shame, may be seen from the following letter which one of them—Mr. Laughton—deemed it his duty to write to the *Natal Mercury* on 16th January:—

"I observe in your leader in this morning's issue of the *Mercury*, you give it as your opinion that Mr. Gandhi was ill-advised in landing and coming through Durban on Wednesday last; and, as I was certainly a party to his coming ashore as he did, I shall feel obliged by your giving me an opportunity of answering your remark. Hitherto it has been useless to speak unless you were prepared to adopt the programme of the demonstration party and its particular mode of attaining its ends; but, now that the Committee is dissolved, and the minds of men are no longer being inflamed, I trust that my letter will receive calm and thoughtful consideration. Let me commence by saying that while the agitation was proceeding I obtained a copy of Mr. Gandhi's pamphlet published in India, and concerning which we received Reuter's cable some months ago, and I can assure your readers that Reuter, not only misrepresented the pamphlet, but misrepresented it so much that, on reading the two, I cannot but come to the conclusion that the writer of the cable had not read the pamphlet. I can say further that there is nothing in the pamphlet which anyone could take exception to on the ground of untruthfulness. Anyone can obtain a copy and read it if he chooses. Let your readers do so and answer honestly: Is there anything in it untrue? Is there anything in it which a political opponent was not justified in saying in support of his cause? Unfortunately, the mind of the public was inflamed by Reuter's version of it, and throughout the recent disturbances there was not a man to point out to the public the difference between the true and the untrue. I don't wish to hurt any man's feelings by repeating the words which he uttered in the hour of excitement and which I know in his calmer moments he will deeply regret, but, in order that the position may be understood, I must place before your readers shortly, what Mr. Gandhi's position was before he took the step of landing and coming into town. I shall, therefore, without mentioning names, give the effect of just a few of the public statements made concerning him: (1) That he had dragged our reputations through the gutters of India, and had painted them as black and filthy as his own face. (2) That he might be allowed to come ashore that we might have the opportunity of spitting at him. (3) That some special treatment, at the word of command, should be meted out to him, and that he should never be allowed to land in Natal. (4) That he was engaging

himself on board the quarantined ship in getting briefs from passengers against the Government: (5) That when three gentlemen, representing the Committee of the demonstration, went on board the 'Courland,' he was in such a 'funk' that he was stowed away in the lowest hold; and, on another occasion, that he was seen sitting on the deck of the 'Courland' in a most dejected mood. These are only a few of the things stated against him, but I take them as sufficient for my purpose. If the above charges were true, if, in other words, he was a cowardly calumniator, stabbing us when at a safe distance, and if he had acted so that he was a fit object to be spat at, and afraid to return and face the consequences, then he was unfitted to be a member of an honourable profession, or to hold the position of leader in a great political question in which his countrymen take as much interest as we do, and who are as much entitled to ventilate their political views as we are. Before he went to India I had met him in business matters on several occasions, and was struck with the anxiety shown by him to avoid litigation and to put matters in dispute on a fair basis, and with the honourable manner in which he dealt with business matters, so much so that I formed a very high opinion concerning him. I say this advisedly, and I have no doubt my words will be approved by the members of the profession who know Mr. Gandhi. It was once said by an eminent judge that success at the Bar was not attained by endeavouring to injure opponents at the Bar, but only by so qualifying one's self as to be equal or superior to such opponents. So in political matters, we must give fairplay to an opponent, and answer his argument by counter-argument, and not by heaving half a brick at his head. I have found Mr. Gandhi, both in legal matters and on the Asiatic question, a fair and honourable opponent, obnoxious to us as his contentions may be, who would scorn to hit below the belt. To vindicate himself before the public, then, it was decided that he should not give his enemies an opportunity of saying that he was 'fucking it' on board the 'Courland,' where he could have stayed for a week if he had chosen; that he should not sneak into Durban like a thief in the night, but that he should face the music like a man and like a political leader, and—give me leave to say—right nobly did he do it. I accompanied him simply as a member of the Bar, to testify by so doing that Mr. Gandhi was an honourable member of an honourable profession, in order that I might raise my voice in protest against the way in which he had been treated, and in the hope that my presence might save him from insult. Your readers have now the whole matter before them, and the reasons which induced Mr. Gandhi to land as he did. He might have kept to the boat at Cato's Creek, when he saw the crowd collecting to receive him; he might have taken refuge in the police-station—but he did not. He said he was quite ready to face the men of Durban, and to trust them as Englishmen. Throughout the trying procession his manliness and pluck could not have been surpassed, and I can assure Natal that he is a man who must be treated as a man. Intimidation is out of the question, because if he knew the Town Hall was going to be thrown at him, I believe, from what I saw, that he would not quail. Now you have the tale impartially told, I hope. Durban has grossly insulted this man. I don't describe the scene; I prefer not. I say Durban, because Durban raised the storm, and is answerable for the result. We are all humiliated at the treatment. Our traditions concerning fair play appear to be in the dust. Let us act like gentlemen, and, however much against the grain it may be, let us express regret handsomely and generously."

III.—By "AN IMPERIALIST."

It would be difficult to find in the history of the English colonies a more sordid and cowardly record than the account of the proceedings in connexion with the anti-Indian demonstration at Durban in December last. The memorial just presented to the Colonial Secretary by the Indian residents in Natal furnishes a full statement of the facts, together with copious extracts from the South African press bearing on the question. The appendix contains the text of the various communications which passed

between the two steamers "Courland" and "Naderi" and the Durban officials, with some other interesting correspondence. The news and comments reprinted from the South African newspapers give ample support to the various contentions of the memorialists. The question at issue is by no means entirely a question of race and colour, although antipathies of race have to some extent entered into the matter. Nor is it, as some have contended, a labour question. It is in the main an effort on the part of a small selfish commercial class, who have utilised existing vulgar prejudices, to secure the exclusion of commercial rivals and perpetuate their own monopoly of South African trade. The arguments which the Colonial Patriotic Union put forward in its petition addressed to the Government are grotesque in the extreme. We are assured that native civilisation will be retarded so long as the introduction of Asiatic races into the colony continues, "their civilisation depending upon their intercourse with the white races." Besides, "the low moral tone and insanitary habits of Asiatics are a constant source of danger to the progress and health of the European population." It is refreshing to note the calm assumption for Europeans of both godliness and cleanliness to the exclusion of their darker brethren. How unfortunate it is that statistics do not bear out the contentions of these guardians of public morals and welfare. The proportion of Asiatic to European inhabitants is not increasing; in fact, the number of European immigrants exceeds the number of free Indian immigrants. And, class for class, Dr. Veale assures us that the Indians live better and in better habitations than Europeans. So, again, the appeal to the example of the Australian colonies in preventing Chinese immigration is quite beside the mark. The Chinese are not British subjects, and the comparison between Chinese and Indians is grossly insulting to the latter. Nor has any objection been made to the introduction of indentured Indians, provided that they are re-conveyed to India on the expiration of their indentures. Their "low moral tone" does not interfere with their employment as personal attendants on the leaders of this insane agitation. It is interesting to note in the account given by the *Times of Natal* that "during the recent commotion at Durban a section of the demonstrators was about to proceed to a ship which had just arrived with some Indians from Delagoa Bay for the purpose of preventing their landing, when some individual called out that the Indians were merchants, and this satisfied the mob." Apparently, therefore, the mob wished to prevent the landing of Indians suspected of being artisans, while their leaders, from equally ignorant and mistaken notions of political economy, wished to prevent the landing of merchants. There is admittedly no competition between the free Indians, to whom the Patriotic Union objects, and the Natives. And the fear of competition between free Indians and the merchants is a nightmare natural enough to men who assert that "John Bull pays through the nose for his adherence to the principle of Free Trade."

The economic importance of the matter is thus seen to be trivial, especially when one remembers

the ignominious collapse of the great organised demonstration, and its resolution into a merely personal assault on Mr. Gandhi, a highly-esteemed lawyer of Natal, who has championed the cause of his countrymen throughout. But there is a graver aspect presented by the attitude of the Natal Government and the Colonial Office towards the quarrel. A leading part in the agitation was taken by a member of the Natal Ministry, the Hon. Harry Escombe. At a public meeting he assured the audience that the Government would certainly bring no force to oppose the demonstration. "It stands on record, then," says the *Natal Witness*, "that the Ministry, on the slightest appearance of a riot at Durban, had resolved that mob law should be supreme." Some explanation of this action may be found in the near approach of the general election in Natal, which may have induced the Government to take underhand means to win the votes of the lowest class of electors. But why was no rebuke administered from the Colonial Office at any time during the twenty-five days which elapsed between the arrival of the two steamers and the landing of their passengers? All that time the agitation was being eagerly fomented, and the Colonial Office was doubtless accurately informed of all that passed. Mr. Chamberlain's deep sense of the injustice done by the Transvaal Government to the Uitlanders was made manifest in his examination of the witnesses before the South African Enquiry Committee. He cannot therefore be blind to the wrongs of British Indian subjects in Natal. Nor can the Government as a whole be accused of insufficient regard for Indian susceptibilities. Were we not told by the supporters of Lord Salisbury's Eastern policy that his considerate treatment of the Sultan was prompted by the fear of wounding the feelings of the millions of Muhammadans who own the Queen's rule in India? Evidence of facts is not wanting to show that the present "strong" Ministry has a tendency to yield with scarcely an effort under pressure of any commercial interest. How far this phenomenon is due to the preponderating influence of the Unionist leader would be a delicate and interesting enquiry. The tendency has at any rate been clearly illustrated in the case of the cotton duties, the open sympathy for the raiders, and the agitation under notice. It is this spurious Imperialism, this narrow commercialism, that is responsible for the blunders and inconsistencies of Imperial policy, which demands above all things a wide and farsighted view.

Neither the present Government nor Lord Salisbury's previous Administration ought apparently to be taunted with blindness to the importance of our African possessions. The hostile demonstration off Isiffor a few years ago, and the present attitude of the Government towards Germany and the Transvaal, prove a determination to maintain existing British rights in Africa. It is almost inconceivable, therefore, that a policy towards Indians calculated permanently to injure the interests of British Africa should be tolerated for an instant. The statistics of the German colonies prove beyond dispute that the great difficulty confronting colonial effort in Africa is the difficulty of finding men able to withstand the dangers of the climate for lengthened periods. The

records of German emigration to America show that the Teuton is not, like the Frenchman, a stay-at-home colonist. Yet, the European population of German Africa has only increased by some 800 in six years, exclusive of the number of additional troops sent out to guard German interests against the suspected designs of the British Colonial Office. Englishmen can live comfortably on the high plateau of South Equatorial Africa which Britain was fortunate enough to secure in the scramble for colonial possessions seven years ago. But there are many important parts of our African Empire as impossible for Englishmen as is Sierra Leone. In an interview with Reuter's agency, Mr. Alfred Pease, M.P., said a few days ago: "The Somaliland Protectorate is a much more important British sphere of influence than people at home seem to think. It is administered by the Bombay Government." In the last sentence is contained a solution for England of the difficulty which the other African Powers may well despair of solving. There is, on the one hand, a large extent of country eminently suitable for Indian settlers, eminently unsuitable for English settlers, except under such conditions as obtain in the Government service, and, indeed, in private commercial undertakings in India. On the other hand, India has a rapidly increasing population, and most opportunely the caste rule against crossing the ocean is, under British influence, slowly but surely losing force. It is of prime importance, therefore, that the connexion already existing between India and Africa should not be interrupted, but strengthened by every possible means. There are all the materials to our hand for another great empire or series of empires in Africa, happier counterparts (one devoutly hopes) of our Indian empire, and colonised by loyal Indian subjects of the crown. If a young colony ignorantly thwarts its own progress by stupid and childish behaviour, it is the duty of the Imperial Government to bring such influence to bear as may awaken it to a sense of its duty and its best interests. It is almost superfluous to remind the Government of the Proclamation of 1858, by which Indians are entitled to the same civil rights as Englishmen throughout the Empire. For when the Home authorities fail to keep peace between the various members of the Empire, the very existence of the Empire is threatened. It is the immediate and pressing duty of the Colonial Office not merely to refuse its sanction to the new measures of persecution proposed by the Natal Government under the head of quarantine, licences, and restriction of immigration, but to insist on a repeal of the Immigration Law Amendment Bill, or at any rate of the objectionable clauses. To prevent the adoption of any measures which may act as a check on the colonisation of Africa by Indians, or force the Indian Government in the interests of its subjects to prohibit emigration to Africa, is a matter of grave Imperial concern.

* * We regret that, in consequence of unusual pressure upon our space this month, Reviews, Correspondence, and much other matter are unavoidably held over.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Daighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JUNE, 1897.

INDIA AND THE "DIAMOND JUBILEE."

"Remember, no government is ultimately strong but in proportion to its kindness and justice; and that a nation does not strengthen by merely multiplying and diffusing itself. We have not strengthened as yet by multiplying into America. Nay, even when it has not to encounter the separating conditions of emigration, a nation need not boast itself of multiplying on its own ground, if it multiplies only as flies or locusts do with the god of flies for its god. It multiplies its strength only by increasing as one great family, in perfect fellowship and brotherhood. And lastly, it does not strengthen itself by seizing dominion over races whom it cannot benefit. Austria is not strengthened, but weakened, by her grasp of Lombardy; and, whatever apparent increase of majesty and of wealth may have accrued to us from the possession of India, whether these prove to us ultimately power or weakness depends wholly on the degree in which our influence on the native race shall be benevolent and exalting."—*Rushin: Lecture on War.*

"It is a thousand pities that the celebration of so unique an occasion as the 'Diamond Jubilee' should take place in a year when the lustre of the brightest jewel in Queen Victoria's diadem is being darkened and dimmed by the black presence of famine and plague. . . . It speaks volumes for the loyalty and love Queen Victoria has inspired in the hearts of her Indian subjects that for her gracious sake they are ready to put aside their mourning for a while in order to give undoubted testimony of their devotion to the Throne by the due celebration of the 'Diamond Jubilee.'"—*The Indian Mirror* (Calcutta.)

"That State then is most excellently administered in which the largest proportion of citizens use the words 'mine' and 'not mine' with reference to the same thing in the same way? Yes, much the best. Or, in other words, that State which comes nearest to the condition of an individual man. Thus, when one of a man's fingers is hurt, the whole association which stretches

right along the body to the soul, so as to form one single system under the governing principle, is sensible of the hurt, and all of it at the same time feels a sympathetic pain, as a whole, with the part that is hurt. And thus it is that we say 'the man is in pain in his finger.' So, too in respect of any part of his body—we speak in the same way of the man's pain if any part is hurt, and of the man's pleasure when it ceases. Yes, he will do; and, to return to your question, there is the closest analogy between such a case and the condition of the most excellently governed State."—*Plato: Republic* (v. 462.)

No Englishman who is not content to limit his current information about the affairs of India to the meagre scraps of news and the occasional essays in criticism that find their way into the enterprising press of the United Kingdom can fail to have noticed the reflections universally excited in India by the approaching festivities in honour of the "record reign." The extract reprinted above from the *Indian Mirror* may be regarded as typical. The *Bombay Gazette* states that the congratulatory address to Her Majesty which has been prepared by the Bombay Corporation will "of course make reference to the terrible visitation which has wrought havoc among the people of Bombay." The *Pioneer* (Allahabad) remarks that "with famine and pestilence afflicting or threatening almost every part of the country" India cannot be expected to be "strongly represented at the Queen's celebration in June." It would be easy to multiply quotations showing how widespread and how acute is the sense of contrast in India between the sufferings of her own people and the rejoicings of her rulers. To do justice to the contrast would test the merit, as it would baffle the powers, of a Swift or a Junius. Perhaps the contrast is not wholly overlooked even in London. One would imagine, at all events, that during the past few weeks some of those who have observed the colossal preparations for sight-seeing, and the "perpetual cataract of congratulation" (to borrow a phrase of Mr. Frederic Harrison's) in the newspapers, must have been troubled with searchings of heart. For many, no doubt, the holiday aspect, and for some the commercial aspect, of the "Diamond Jubilee" is enough. Many more, no doubt, are merely bored. But among the thoughtful few there must be some whose thoughts have turned to India, and to whose minds her present plight suggests an occasion not so much of unctuous self-praise as of sackcloth and ashes. It is not merely that India is in pain. The British empire, if we may adapt the illustration employed by Plato, is in pain in India.

India is, then, in a very literal sense, the skeleton at the feast of the "Diamond Jubilee." But to realise that fact is of little use unless it prompts the enquiry: Cannot something be done? Cannot this year of Imperial celebrations be rendered noteworthy, after all, in Indian history for something less dismal than the famine and the plague? The

question is, what ought that "something" to be? Well, in the first place it is easy to say what it ought not to be. An official expression of sympathy and regret, however gracious the terms in which it may be conveyed, will not be enough. It will not be enough, though it may be in accordance with precedent, to pay the Indian people the compliment of charging them with the cost of the Jubilee reception which, if report may be trusted, is to be held at the India Office because, by a curious coincidence, the rooms at the India Office (for which the indigent taxpayers of India paid) happen to be more splendid than the rooms at the other Government offices (for which the British taxpayer paid.) Nor will it be enough, though it has hitherto been the common practice, to make India's chief share in a notable occasion consist in a handful of decorations and promotions conferred upon persons who have distinguished themselves by blind subservience to officialism and by consistent opposition, and even something like treachery, to their more enlightened and liberal-minded fellow-countrymen. The rumour is already current that a decoration of this unenviable kind is to be conferred upon the slight politician who for the past few years has been the humble and convenient instrument of the less creditable purposes of the India Office. Such an incident, if it occurred, would be merely grotesque. Far from affording any satisfaction to the Indian people it would merely—so far as it might be deemed worthy of serious notice at all—tend to confirm unpleasant suspicions and strengthen a widespread antipathy.

No; the benefits which should be conferred upon India—or, to speak more accurately, the instalment of justice which should be rendered to her—in celebration of the sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign must be sought elsewhere. "Whatever apparent increase of majesty and wealth may have accrued to us from the possession of India, whether these prove to us ultimately power or weakness depends wholly on the degree in which our influence on the native race shall be benevolent and exalting." Nowhere shall he find a closer parallel to Ruskin's words than in the gracious Proclamation issued by the Queen in Council to the princes, chiefs, and people of India in 1858, when the administration of British India was transferred from the East India Company to the Crown:

"We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil. . . . In their prosperity will be our strength; in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward."

Now, there is a special reason for recalling this Proclamation on the present occasion, for in the

Jubilee year 1887 her Majesty the Queen repeated her words of "kindness and justice," and shortly afterwards the people of India received the substantial advantages arising from the expansion of the Legislative Councils. What could be more fitting or more useful than that the "Diamond Jubilee" should be signalled by the further extension of the Indian Councils Act? The lines upon which such extension should run are familiar to everybody who knows anything at all about the Indian National Congress. The two points of chief importance are that (a) the number and (b) the powers of the representative members should be increased. It would be difficult to exaggerate the advantages of such a reform, which is more than justified by the conspicuous success with which the experimental measure now in operation has everywhere been attended. Nor is that all. Another passage in the Proclamation of 1858 was as follows:

"And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge."

"So far as may be." Whatever the precise meaning of that limiting term may be, nobody can justify a system which at one and the same time professes to admit Indians equally with Englishmen to the competition for posts in the Indian Civil Service and, because the examination is not held simultaneously in Calcutta and in London, imposes upon Indian candidates a heavy—often a prohibitive—preliminary fine. The House of Commons resolved four years ago, on the motion of Mr. Herbert Paul, that this contradiction between our theory and practice should cease. It has not ceased yet. On the contrary it is avowedly maintained in order to keep down the number of successful Indian candidates. Here, if anywhere, one would think it an opportunity ready to hand to cause the "Diamond Jubilee" to be remembered with gratitude in India. Let effect be given at last to the resolution of the House of Commons which the Government of India has hitherto been permitted to over-ride. If, in addition to these "concessions," steps are also taken to give the Indian *rayat* reasonable fixity of tenure—a thing which the present famine has once again proved to be a necessity of the case—and to revive, in accordance with the suggestion of many of the witnesses recently heard by the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, the advantages of the Parliamentary stock-takings which were periodic under the rule of the East India Company, then, indeed, some consolation will have been extended to India in her hour of mourning. Her Majesty the Queen has on more than one occasion personally

intervened in the interests of her loyal and loving subjects in India. Is it too much to hope that in this year of happy omen, not unmingled with tribulation, the same gracious influence may once more be exercised in works of "kindness and justice"?

A HISTORY OF GREEK LITERATURE.¹

"THANK you so much, Professor," a fair member of one of those numerous companies whom a thirst for knowledge, a love of travel, and the enchantments of Dr. Lunn and Mr. Perowne have lately drawn to the Eternal City, was overheard saying, "thank you so much for your most interesting antiquarian lecture. There was just one point that I felt to be a little obscure. Would you mind my asking you? Were those Vestal Virgins of whom you spoke Roman Catholics?" To such confusions of mind may the over-hasty absorption of indiscriminate information beguile us. Mr. Heinemann's new series of "Literatures of the World," like all books that attempt to condense into small compass a vast quantity of knowledge and yet aim at being attractive and easy to follow, opens indefinite possibilities in this direction to the unwary. *Verbum sapientibus*: there are no "short cuts" to sound knowledge discovered yet, though "many run to and fro" and believe that they have found them.

Mr. Murray's volume is certainly one to be handled with some caution by the general reader and the University Extension student. Those who, being themselves ignorant of Greek, desire to gain some notion of the main characteristics of the great masters of Greek literature must still be referred to Mr. Jebb's admirable Primer. But those who read Greek authors, or have read them in youth, should make trial of Mr. Murray. They will learn something from his suggestive criticisms, they will be interested in reports of the latest German speculations, they will be delighted by frequent flashes of wit, and they will (we hope) be a little scandalised by his modernity. It is this last characteristic on which, at the risk of being thought ungracious and ungrateful, it seems most necessary to dwell, because it is likely to be disregarded or even welcomed by some of our professional critics. The importation of slang and current allusion into a serious work on Greek literature by a distinguished Oxford scholar is not a thing to be dismissed with indifference. Whatever may be the use or the uselessness of a classical training for daily life, there can be no question that for literature, at least, the man who has made a study of Greek prose and poetry is in possession

of a standard, of a touchstone, to which others can hardly attain. He knows the pure gold of "the best thoughts expressed in the best way," with a sureness of instinct denied to the reader who knows only the moderns. If that is so, he has a duty to perform to the literature and the criticism of his own day—the strenuous upholding of the standard he has learnt from the ancients. Does this seem an "impossible loyalty" in these days of unlimited printing? Be it so; Oxford, the "home of impossible loyalties," expects it of her sons. But the truth surely is that this loyalty is neither impossible nor a very grievous act of self-denial. Mr. Mackail has shown, in his masterly book on Latin literature, that it is possible to write on classical themes with self-restraint, with dignity and delicate grace, and yet interest a large number of readers. The wide and warm welcome given to that book is a fact worth the attention of any lovers of the classics who are disposed to despair of the maintenance of old literary standards and traditions. In direct contrast to Mr. Mackail, Mr. Murray comes dangerously near surrendering the citadel of culture, and it is not easy to see that he gains anything by coquetting with the enemy. Is anything gained, for instance, by calling Xenophon a "filibuster"? Slang, it has been well said, is "all very well for a first-term Freshman to astonish his sister with;" and Mr. Murray's undergraduate audience will perhaps like the expression. But will it in any sense be helpful to them? Will they understand Xenophon's life or character better for it? Here is what Walter Savage Landor, in his "Imaginary Conversations," had to say on this particular word, in its earlier form, *filibustier*—

"While we reject the good of our own countrymen, we adopt the bid of the foreigner. We are much in the habit of using *filibustier*. Surely, we might let the French take and torture our *freebooter*. In our fondness for making verbs out of substantives, we even go to the excess of *filibustering*. And now from course vulgarity let us turn our eyes—"

The remainder of this last sentence does not concern us, but it was necessary to quote its opening words to show the full extent of Landor's condemnation. Again, are we helped by hearing Thucydides called "a trained stylist"? or by having λέσχη translated "Conversation-hall"? These are small points in themselves, but they are significant. They seem to show that Mr. Murray, with all his learning and all his enthusiasm for Greek poetry, has not learnt, and is therefore not at pains to teach, the great lesson of perfect artistic form that is conveyed in every masterpiece of Greek literature and Greek sculpture. Still more ominous is Mr. Murray's preference for Euripides to Sophocles. A critic has congratulated him on the courage he has shown in evidently disliking Sophocles. But courage is not

¹ "A History of Ancient Greek Literature." By Gilbert Murray, M.A. ("Literatures of the World," Vol. I.) London: W. Heinemann.

the only qualification for a literary guide, and there is such a thing as an absolute standard in art, or we had better give up writing books on literature. What does the preference of Euripides to Sophocles really mean? It is a suffrage for the "problem-poet," for the Ibsen of his day (the comparison is Mr. Murray's own). It is more than a mere appreciation of him. That Mr. Murray has written with sympathetic insight of Euripides, "who broke himself against the bars both of life and of poetry," is matter for gratitude. But to prefer Euripides to Sophocles is to prefer the poet who sees life unsteadily and in fragments to the poet who sees it steadily and whole. Our literary criticism is sadly in danger of forgetting that any fool can ask more questions than a wise man can answer. We do not understand the self-restraint of the great poet or novelist. We think him superficial sometimes, because he deliberately turns away from some question that he might ask and will not. We think he does not see the question: he sees it far better than we; but he will not raise it out of wantonness, nor unless he can put mankind on the road to a solution. He will help us, if he can; if not, he will not add to our misery.

"That strain I heard was of a higher mood,
But now my oat proceeds."

There is an altogether minor matter on which, as this is the first volume of a series, it seems worth while to make a suggestion. Mr. Heinemann or Mr. Gosse has set his authors a difficult task: the combination of literary criticism with the results of the latest scientific research. Mr. Murray says he has "tried to conceal all the laboratory work." He has not altogether succeeded: the name of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf occurs too frequently for the peace of mind of the old-fashioned reader. Would it not be well to relegate the "laboratory work" to appendices, after the fashion of the useful notes appended to each chapter of Holm's "History of Greece"? The scientific student would welcome more numerous and systematic references than Mr. Murray has given; he might have them to his heart's content, and the non-scientific reader would go on his way undisturbed.

If Mr. Murray's book had not been very good it would not have been worth the pains we have taken to point out its blemishes. The faults are chiefly dangerous because the book is in many ways so good—so fresh and stimulating and vigorous, so full of learning, and yet so full of interest. The clear and reasonable account of the Homeric question, the fine eulogy of Pindar, the appreciation of both sides in the tragic conflict between Socrates and Anytus, the discussion of the work of Thucydides—these are some of the notably strong points.

The preface warns us against the error of con-

ceiving the old Greeks as "all much alike." It is their variety, Mr. Murray thinks, that makes them so living to us. He has certainly made his own portraits of them human, living, and varied. Behind each writer he has striven to see the man, and the result is always an interesting, if not always a convincing, picture. Perhaps it was inevitable that in this attempt to come to close quarters with the ancients, as in the attempt of Euripides to treat gods and heroes realistically, something of the ideal and heroic, something even of dignity, should be sacrificed. Neither in Euripides nor in Mr. Murray do we feel that the "touches of things common" always "rise to touch the spheres." But of both writers it may be true that the sources of their strength and weakness lie close together; and the blemishes to which attention has been called are partly the defects of the qualities that give the book its freshness and animation. Yet, when all allowances have been made, one cannot escape the feeling that the most serious faults might have been lessened by a reverent study of that Sophocles whom the successor of Professor Jebb at Glasgow regards with something like indifference.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Great success has so far attended the "platform campaign" which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Professor G. K. Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer are now conducting in various parts of the United Kingdom. Although the season of the year is not favourable to public meetings, and there has been much else to distract the attention even of persons who are politically minded, the Indian speakers have attracted large and attentive audiences, and there is every reason for congratulation upon the admirable work they are doing in spreading among British electors the Indian view of the Indian question.

The series of meetings was opened in South Lambeth on May 13th. Mr. J. Herbert Roberts, M.P., presided. On May 19th, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee addressed a large and enthusiastic meeting at Sunderland. Among other places for which meetings have been fixed may be mentioned Clapham (May 20th), Belper (May 23rd), Mile End (May 25th), Hastings (May 26th), and Lewisham (June 12th). A series of meetings in Yorkshire is also being arranged, and it is expected that meetings will be held in Gloucester and the Ealing division—Lord George Hamilton's constituency.

As an indication of the results obtained by this campaign of public meetings it may be interesting to quote the following from a letter received by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress from the Secretary to the Sunderland Liberal Association:

"Our meeting last night was a grand success. The audience

were delighted, and the effect of the speeches is that many friends are won over to your side. I trust—and I speak on behalf of our committee—that you will be able to send us down another deputation later. I can promise them a really hearty north-country welcome. With best wishes for the success of your movement," etc.

Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee and Mr. Subramania Iyer have now completed their evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. It is stated that no further witness is likely to be heard except Lord Dufferin, and that the Commission will forthwith proceed to the consideration of its report.

The Mansion House Fund amounted on May 21st to £527,600.

"After all, it is very probable," writes a correspondent of the *Westminster Gazette*, "that the Marquis of Lorne, and not Lord Zetland, is to have the succession to the Viceroyalty of India. The fact of the matter is, the member for South Manchester has been desirous of engaging once more in serious administrative work, and he would like to take either India or Victoria—Dublin Castle being out of the question. The difficulty has been the health of the Princess Louise. It is just possible, however, that the matter may be compromised by letting Lord Lorne, as Governor-General, be alone during the Calcutta season, while the Marchioness proceeds to Simla for the season in the hills."

Mr. J. Herbert Roberts, M.P., has given notice in the House of Commons that he will, at an early date, move the following Resolution: "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in future no Indian prince or chief shall be deposed on the ground of maladministration or misconduct until the fact of such maladministration or misconduct shall have been established to the satisfaction of a public tribunal which shall command the confidence alike of the Government and of the princes and chiefs of India."

The following paragraph appeared in the *Daily News* of May 13th:

We understand that the Marchioness of Salisbury's health is not yet sufficiently robust to allow of her going through the fatigue of a great reception at the Foreign Office on the evening of the official celebration of the Queen's birthday. The Queen's birthday banquet will be given as usual at the Foreign Office to the Ambassadors and Ministers, and it is understood the reception afterwards will be held at the India Office, Lady George Hamilton or the Duchess of Devonshire presiding. The India Office has some magnificent rooms, and lately direct communication between the Foreign Office and the India Office has been established.

"The India Office has some magnificent rooms"—yes, and the indigent taxpayers of India paid for them. On a former occasion India was further required to pay the expenses of a State entertainment because it happened to be given in the India Office. Is that "melancholy meanness" to be repeated on the present occasion?

A series of articles dealing with the grievances of British Indian subjects in South Africa will be found in another part of the present issue of INDIA. The following letter, on the same subject, from the Maharaja of Darbhanga was printed in the *Times* of May 8rd:—

"Sir,—May I be permitted to appeal through your columns to the Colonial Secretary, and to the Parliament, the Press, and the people of England, on behalf of my fellow-countrymen

now subject to grievous hardships and difficulties in Natal, South Africa? The Imperial sympathy for India and Indians has just now been shown with a magnificent generosity by the whole British nation, from her Gracious Majesty the Queen-Empress down to the humblest contributor to the Indian Famine Relief Fund. These generous sentiments have not been confined to the English people in the United Kingdom; they have been shared by every class of her Majesty's subjects scattered over all parts of her world-embracing dominions, and, not least, by the colonists in South Africa. Surely the moment is an auspicious one for a frank appeal both from India and England to the nobler feelings of British Africa, especially in Natal.

"The objections that have been alleged to exist in Natal against the free and friendly admission of my countrymen to that colony have been proved to be absolutely unfounded; that fact is now admitted by everyone, including the Colonial Secretary. And it is now stated that the question is a labour question, and not a racial one. But, if that be so in truth, surely it is obvious that the restrictions sought to be imposed on the admission of Indian labour to-day may, for the same reasons and with equal justice, be imposed on the admission of English labour to-morrow. There can be no question as to what the policy of the Imperial Government is with regard to this matter. A Government that desires that President Kruger should confer the rights of citizenship upon the foreign subjects of the Transvaal must at least be equally anxious that British subjects, though they be Indians, should not in a British colony of Natal be treated as aliens and be subjected to serious difficulties. But no responsible Indian statesman would dream for a moment of asking for the coercion of Natal by the Imperial Government. And we have sufficient confidence in the good feeling of the British colonists in Natal to believe that such a course would be entirely unnecessary. But we do ask the Imperial Government and the Parliament and the Press of the United Kingdom, as representing the whole British people, to join us in urgently appealing to the good feeling and to the Imperial instincts of the authorities and the people of Natal. The people of India feel sure that no commemoration of this auspicious year of the Diamond Jubilee of her Majesty would be more pleasing to the Queen-Empress than the adoption by her colonial subjects of such a liberal and friendly policy towards India and Indians as would show that we are all alike proud of being fellow-subjects of the greatest empire the sun shines upon, and in the enjoyment of the blessings of equal laws and equal rights under one of the best of earthly sovereigns."

The Appendix to the Reports of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Petitions for the present session contains the following:—

"169. The humble Petition of the Inhabitants of Pandharpur Taluka, District Sholapur, Bombay Presidency, India, in public meeting assembled,

"Most respectfully sheweth,

"That the resolution of your honourable House, by which India is made to bear the ordinary expenses of the Indian army sent on Suakin expedition, has given great dissatisfaction to them; that they had very strong hopes that the injustice in connexion with the payment of the expenses of the above-said expedition would be at once removed when the question was referred to your honourable House, but they now find to their great regret, that when the interests of India and England are in a conflict India has to go to the wall, to suffer loss and incur burdensome responsibility. That it is, no doubt, a very serious grievance that India has had to pay the expenses of an expedition with which she has no direct connexion whatsoever, whether commercial or political. But there is a still greater grievance, and a cause for real and serious anxiety, which is that the Parliament, which is always regarded to be the final seat of justice, sometimes utterly disregards the just interest and complaints of her Majesty's subjects in the far East; and, lastly, that as a consequence of this step taken by your honourable House, a deep feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction has spread itself here, and that they consequently pray that your honourable House will, with a view to check it, correct the past error by a reconsideration of the same, and adopt means against its recurrence in future."

The petition, which contained 28½ signatures, was presented by Sir William Wedderburn.

The Countess of Warwick entertained a large party to lunch at Warwick Castle, on May 10th. Many of the guests were those who had interested themselves in the sub-section "Education" at the Victorian Era Exhibition, of which the Countess is president, and travelled from London and Oxford by special train. "On arrival at the castle they were received," writes a reporter, "by the Earl and Countess in the great hall, and at two o'clock lunch was served in the banquetting hall, nearly eighty guests sitting down. The Blue Hungarian band played during lunch and afterwards, while later in the afternoon Miss Esther Palliser delighted all by her singing. During the afternoon most of the guests were taken over the castle and shown its treasures and points of interest by Lord Warwick, while others wandered through the grounds with Lady Warwick and Lord and Lady Algernon Gordon-Lennox, or went in the steam launch down the river Avon, to see some of the most picturesque views. At five o'clock tea was served, after which the large party dispersed, having greatly enjoyed their visit." Among those present were Sir William Wedderburn, Professor Gokhale and Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee. Professor Gokhale has, we understand, undertaken to read a paper dealing with Education in India at the "Victorian Era Exhibition."

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

I.—EVIDENCE OF MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

We print below Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's summary of the "most important contentions" contained in his evidence tendered to the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. Mr. Dadabhai had submitted to the Royal Commission a series of six printed statements, which he wished to be regarded as his evidence in chief. The following summary of them was prepared by him for use as a brief recapitulation when he came to be orally examined as a witness on March 25th. The course of cross-examination prevented the summary from being read through in the order in which it was written (and is here printed). But each of the contentions contained in it was stated by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and may be found in the official report of his evidence:—

"I have handed in to the Commission six printed statements. These statements contained the facts, figures and authorities upon which I rely, and I am prepared to be cross-examined upon them.

The headings under which my evidence falls are: (A) The Administration of Expenditure, (B) the Apportionment of Charge, (C) practical remedies. Upon each of these headings, I am prepared to state categorically my most important contentions on behalf of India.

With reference to (A) Administration of Expenditure, I consider that the Act of 1833, confirmed by the pledges contained in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, conferred upon Indians a right to their full claim and share of public employment and emoluments and twice in their own expenditure, in order to secure their happiness and prosperity and

good government and attachment to British rule and the prosperity of the British people themselves.

I maintain that the administration of Indian expenditure is not conducted according to the principles thus laid down, and that the non-fulfilment of these pledges has produced poverty and degradation; the inherent and essential defect of British administration being the financial, political and intellectual drain, which is inseparable from a remote foreign dominion exercised in disregard of the sound principles above stated.

In my six statements I set forth the facts of India's poverty, as shown by the comparative production and consumption of each province, by calculating the average production of India per head; by analysing the trade returns; and by reference to the small amount of revenue obtained after exhausting all sources of taxation.

I maintain that the impoverishment and degradation of British India has been caused by the compulsory employment of costly foreign official agencies and foreign capital (represented by the public debt, political and commercial) beyond the means of the taxpayer, resulting in a drain from British India, financial, political and intellectual—aggravated by heavy frontier Imperial war expenditure—and that indirectly the foreign dominion has caused a further drain by creating a practical monopoly in favour of foreign private capital which reaps the advantage of British India's material resources.

With reference to (B) apportionment of charge, my propositions are—

(1.) That it is the desire of the British people that British rule should be one of justice and righteousness for the benefit of both India and Britain, and not for the benefit of Britain only to the detriment of India, and that the financial relations in apportionment of charge should be as those between two partners and not as those between master and slave.

(2.) That upon this equitable basis the apportionment of expenditure in which Britain and India are jointly interested should be according to extent of the interest and according to capacity to pay.

(3.) That the creation and maintenance of British Imperial supremacy in India is a British interest of the first magnitude; yet, with a few exceptions, India has been unjustly charged with the whole cost of creating and maintaining the British Imperial supremacy without Britain paying any portion, and without India being allowed to share in the advantages connected with that supremacy.

(4.) That law and order are beneficial to India, but they are also a British interest, as a condition essential to the very existence and prosperity of British rule.

(5.) That, assuming, as it is said, that India should bear all those charges for internal and external protection which she would have to bear if British rule did not exist, she should not bear the special cost of European Agency so far as used solely to maintain British Supremacy. And moreover that if British rule did not exist, every one employed will be an Indian and not an European.

(6.) That, as a practical arrangement, Britain should pay for all British employed in Britain, that

India should pay for all Indians employed in India, and that as regards British employed in India and Indians employed in Britain, there should be an equitable apportionment according to respective benefit and capacity to pay.

To put it still more moderately, the payments to Europeans in both countries may be divided half and half between Britain and India.

(7.) That in the Army, Navy, and Civil Service, public employment, with its advantages and emoluments, should be proportioned to the charge; and in considering this point it should be borne in mind that in India, Government employment monopolises in great part the sphere of private enterprise and the open professions as practised in Britain.

(8.) That the wars carried on beyond the Indian Frontier of 1858 are, as stated by Lord Salisbury, "an indivisible part of a great Imperial question," and that therefore the cost should primarily be borne by the Imperial Exchequer, India contributing a fair share on account of, and in proportion to, indirect and incidental benefits accruing to her, and direct share in the services.

(9.) That from April, 1882, to March, 1891, nearly Rs. 129 millions were spent from Indian revenues beyond the Western and North-Western Frontiers of India, for avowedly Imperial purposes, and that a fair share of this amount should be refunded from the Imperial Exchequer, and similarly for the cost of the Burmese War.

Since putting in my statements I have obtained further figures showing the amounts spent from Indian revenues upon military operations beyond the frontiers of India. Col. H. B. Hanna, in his book "Backwards or Forwards," gives at page 40 a table and makes the total about Rs. 714,500,000—out of which the British Exchequer paid £5,000,000 towards the expenses of the Afghan War. Besides this amount he points out several omissions.

As regards (C) Practical Remedies, the principle I approve is that which was declared by the Duke of Devonshire, who said "If the country is to be better governed, that can only be done by the employment of the best and most intelligent of the Natives in the Service," and, as pointed out by Sir W. W. Hunter, "If we are to govern the people of India efficiently and cheaply, we must govern them by means of themselves, and pay for the administration at the market rates of Native labour."

An administration conducted on these principles will stop the material, political and intellectual drain from India.

In the case of the Mysore State this method was adopted by Lords Salisbury and Iddesleigh "as a guarantee for the good government of the people and for the security of British rights and interests." This experiment, though disapproved by the Anglo-Indian authorities, was loyally and effectively carried out by them, and proved a brilliant success, resulting in a contented people, a full treasury, moral and material progress, and attachment to British supremacy. It is a brilliant episode in British Indian History.

Similarly, British India will be prosperous and contented if the same principles are followed, local administration being entrusted to competent Native

officials, under European control, co-operating with representative assemblies.

I gladly recognise the benefits of British rule, especially as regards law and order, education, and freedom of the Press and public meeting; but I believe that British power and influence are much weakened by the refusal to administer expenditure in a way so as to give the people justice and a voice in their own affairs, by the consequent "extreme poverty" of the masses, and by the non-fulfilment of the solemn pledges, given by Parliament and the Crown, of equal opportunity in the public service to all subjects of Her Majesty; and I sincerely desire to see British rule strengthened on the lines most beneficial to the people both of India and of Britain.

I desire to put in my correspondence with the War Office, the Admiralty and the Civil Service Commissioners. In this I claim that neither the War Office nor the Admiralty had any authority or power to exclude Indians from the Commissioned ranks.

II.—EVIDENCE OF MR. SURENDRA NATH BANERJEA.

We take the following passages from the evidence recently given by Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee before the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure:—

[GROWTH OF EXPENDITURE: THE SERVICES.]

The question of the wider employment of the people of India in the public service of their own country is more or less a financial problem. The expenditure has gone on increasing, especially in the military department; and Indian public opinion regards the growth of military expenditure as utterly beyond what the country can bear, and as seriously interfering with legitimate expenditure on the most necessary domestic improvements. The people of India who are capable of forming a judgment on the subject are at one with Sir H. Brackenbury in the opinion that the cost of the portion of the Indian army in excess of what is necessary for maintaining the internal peace of the country should be met from the British Exchequer, and the expenses on the salaries of the European portion of the army ought to be fairly apportioned between England and India. Until this is done, the resources of India will not be found equal for the purposes of good and progressive Government, and no improvement is possible in the condition of the masses. By the wider employment of the people of India in the public service, economy would be introduced and an impetus imparted to the intellectual and moral elevation of the people. Ten years ago, the Public Service Commission presided over by the late Sir Charles Aitchison, at that time Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, and consisting of some of the most distinguished officials and non-official representatives of the day, reported upon the question of public employment in India. The gist of their recommendations may be summarized as follows: "That indigenous agency should be more largely employed in the public service, that the recruitment of the official staff in England should be curtailed and advantage taken of qualified agency obtainable in India." In other words, the Provincial Service recruited in India should be the backbone of the administrative agency, subject to European supervision and control. "Considerations of policy and economy alike require," observed the Commission in their report, "that, so far as is consistent with the ends of good government, the recruitment of the official staff in England should be curtailed and advantage taken of qualified agency obtainable in India." As a matter of fact, however, the higher appointments in almost all branches of the Public Service are held by Europeans, although more than ten years have elapsed since the Commission have submitted their Report. The Public Service Commission found in 1886 that, out of 1,015 officers in the superior engineer establishment, as many as 810 were non-domiciled Europeans, 119 Europeans domiciled in India including Eurasians, and only 86 were natives of India (page

122, Public Service Commission Report.) The Commission observed, to use their own words, recruitment from the Cooper's Hill College as being "at present excessive." We find, however, that at present there are 800 engineers of the superior establishment, of whom only 98 are Indians.

COVENANTED APPOINTMENTS.

The Public Service Commission recommended that one-third of the Judgeships should be held by members of the Provincial Service. The total number of district and sessions judges is 126; out of these 5 only are Indians, according to Mr. Jacob's table. This cannot be correct, for in Bengal alone we have 7 district and sessions judgeships held by members of the Statutory Service. But even in Bengal, which is considered to be the most advanced province in the matter of the employment of natives of India in the public service, the percentage recommended by the Public Service Commission has not been attained in regard to a class of appointments for which natives of India are considered to be specially qualified; for out of 30 district and sessions judgeships only 7 are held by members of the Statutory Service. According to the recommendation of the Public Service Commission, 10 of these appointments should be held by them. Further, according to the recommendations of the Public Service Commission, one membership of the Board of Revenue, one commissionership of division, one under-secretaryship to Government, one secretaryship to the Board of Revenue should be excluded from the list of reserved appointments and should be held by members of the Provincial Service. In the North-West Provinces the secretaryship to the Board of Revenue is held by a member of the Provincial Service. As members of the Statutory and Provincial Services draw two-thirds of the salary attached to the reserved posts, when they hold such posts, there would be considerable saving by giving fuller effect to the recommendations of the Public Service Commission. On the Bengal establishment there are 267 civilians, including members of the Statutory and Provincial Service holding Civil Service appointments, of whom 24 are Indians, and 243 are Europeans. The monthly salaries, including allowances drawn by the Indians, come up to Rs. 30,000; those drawn by the Europeans come up to Rs. 4,00,100 in round numbers.

THE POLICE (BENGAL GOVERNMENT).

In the same way, in the Police Department the higher appointments in Bengal are practically monopolised by Europeans, though the Public Service Commission distinctly recommend (page 120 of the Report) "that endeavours should be made to introduce a reasonable proportion of native officers, due regard being always had to the efficiency of the service." Including the Calcutta Police, there are 108 of these appointments from the post of superintendents and upwards. Of these 101 appointments are held by Europeans and 7 only by natives of India. The monthly salaries, including allowances of the European employees, come up to Rs. 60,000 in round numbers, the monthly salaries of the native employees come up to Rs. 3,000 in round numbers. In this connexion I may mention that a competitive examination is held in Calcutta and another in London for recruitment to the higher offices in the Police. From these examinations natives of India are excluded, although there is nothing to prevent their appearing at the open competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Service, provided, of course, they complied with the necessary terms and conditions. There seems to be no reason for this exclusion on the ground of race; for the District and Assistant Superintendents of Police have done their work admirably; and one of them recently distinguished himself by the capture of a number of dacoits, as will be seen from the following report in the newspapers:—

"Babu Girindra Chunder Mukerji, Assistant Superintendent of the Bengal Police, had an encounter with five dacoits on the road connecting Ichhapore and Shannagar, on Saturday night. The dacoits attacked the coachman of the hackney-carriage in which the police-officer was driving from Naihaty to Barrack-pore at midnight. Hearing the noise, he jumped out of the carriage, and caught the men. They were then placed inside the carriage and brought to the Barrack-pore Police Station. They will be tried by the Deputy Magistrate of Baraset."

Further, the exclusion of natives of India from the examinations to which I have referred is in direct conflict with the terms of the Proclamation of her Majesty of the 1st November, 1858, which, in clear and emphatic terms, laid down

that merit was to be the sole test of qualification for office in India, and that Indian subjects, of whatever race or creed, were to be freely admitted to all offices the duties of which they were qualified, by their ability, education, and integrity, duly to discharge.

In Bengal, burglaries and other offences against property are believed to be on the increase, and the people of Bengal attribute this partly to the want of detective power in the European heads of the District Police, and to their want of familiarity with our customs and language. It is a notorious fact that a District Superintendent of Police is unable, through his ignorance of the language of the people, to enquire into the ordinary cases of theft and burglary; and the larger employment of Indians in the Police would therefore add to the efficiency of the force, while reducing total expenditure.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (BENGAL).

In the Public Works Department we find the same thing. There are 69 appointments in the superior establishment, of which 53 are held by Europeans, and 16 are held by Indians. The total monthly salaries, including allowances drawn by the Europeans, come up to Rs. 49,000 in round numbers, the monthly salaries paid to the Indians come up to Rs. 6,000 in round numbers.

OPIMUM DEPARTMENT.

In the Opium Department, excluding the opium agents and the factory superintendents, who are covenanted civil and medical officers belonging to the Indian Medical or the Indian Civil Service, we find there are 27 sub-deputy opium agents classified under five grades in the Civil List of the Bengal Presidency corrected up to 1st January, 1897. Together their salaries come up to Rs. 17,600; not a single native of India has a place in these grades, although the Public Service Commission recommended "equality of treatment of all classes of her Majesty's subjects" in regard to their appointment to offices in this department. Out of 44 assistant sub-deputy agents, there are only 9 who are natives of India. Their monthly salaries come up to Rs. 2,250. The monthly salaries paid to the European employees come up to Rs. 10,400.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

With regard to the employment of natives of India in the Customs Department, it may not be out of place to quote the remarks of Sir Charles Trevelyan: "There are whole classes of employment," said Sir Charles Trevelyan, "for which the natives are specially qualified. The natives are specially qualified for revenue functions. The whole of the appointments in the Customs might be filled by natives." But what are the facts? With one exception, the superior appointments in the Customs Department in Calcutta are filled by Europeans. Their total monthly salaries come up to Rs. 12,360. There is not a single Hindu or Muhammadan name to be found among the officers of the Preventive Service, although the Public Service Commission recommended that "there is no ground for the exclusion of qualified candidates of any race from the appraiser's or the Preventive Branches of the Department." The Public Service Commission point out that "native Christians in Bombay have been employed in the Preventive Service, while a Brahmin Preventive officer in Madras is admittedly efficient and in discharging his duties has experienced no difficulty owing to his race" (page 97, Public Service Commission Report). I have been informed that a Parsi gentleman so efficiently performed his duties as an appraiser in the Bombay Customs Department that he was asked by the authorities, after he had retired on pension to *rejoin* his appointment on the passing of the recent Tariff Act imposing duties on imported goods.

MEDICAL SERVICES (BENGAL).

In 1877 there were 67 commissioned medical officers, of whom 5 were Indians. There were in addition to the above 28 uncovenanted medical officers. Of these, 7 were apothecaries (all Europeans), and 3 were Indians. In 1887, there were 62 commissioned medical officers, of whom only 6 were Indians. There were 29 uncovenanted medical officers, of whom only 4 were natives of India, the other 25 were Europeans and Eurasians (13 apothecaries and 12 non-military medical men). There were 142 assistant surgeons. In 1897 there were 66 commissioned medical officers, of whom only 4 were Indians. Thus practically the number of commissioned officers on the Bengal

establishment who were natives of India remained stationary for a period extending over twenty years from 1877 to 1897. In fact, the number in 1897 was slightly less. In 1897, there were 36 uncommissioned civil medical officers, of whom only 4 were Indians, the rest were Europeans and Eurasians, 28 were apothecaries and 7 non-military Europeans. The total amount of monthly pay drawn by the commissioned officers in 1897 was Rs. 66,024, out of which the four Indians get Rs. 3,870 per month. There are 138 assistant surgeons, all Indians, drawing a salary of Rs. 26,296 among them. Thus it will be seen that the 62 European commissioned officers draw more than double the salary of all the assistant surgeons in Bengal put together, whose number, it should be remarked, is double the number of the commissioned officers. It will thus be seen that, while the number of apothecaries holding the higher appointments has increased by over 300 per cent., the number of natives in India employed has actually decreased. There is a distinct tendency to put the apothecaries who are now called assistant military surgeons over the heads of Indian assistant surgeons, although their medical training is inferior to that of the Indian assistant surgeons. Appointments have been taken away from the Indian assistant surgeons and given to the military assistant surgeons. Their status has been improved. They begin on a salary of Rs. 75 a month; the assistant surgeons begin on Rs. 50 as supernumeraries. The pay of the assistant surgeons was fixed about sixty years ago as follows:—Third grade, Rs. 100; second grade, Rs. 150; and first grade, Rs. 200. There are besides a few prize appointments which carry a higher salary. The scale of pay remains unchanged after sixty years, notwithstanding the petitions presented to the Government on their behalf, notwithstanding that the pay of the subordinate judicial and executive services has been raised, and notwithstanding the fact that the price of food has more than doubled itself within the last sixty years. While the highly paid officers of Government receive Exchange Compensation Allowance, it is remarkable that this deserving class of Indian public servants should continue to draw a scale of pay which was fixed for them sixty years ago.

REORGANISATION OF THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

The medical service may be so organised as to lead to considerable economy without interfering with efficiency. There are at present (July, 1896) about 375 commissioned medical officers in Bengal, besides twenty-five military assistant-surgeons who have received honorary commissions. Of the medical officers who have received their commissions in England about one-half are employed on military duties, mainly in military charge of native regiments. The remainder are in civil employ. The medical charge of a native regiment may with advantage be held by a native military assistant surgeon, instead of the more expensive commissioned European medical officer.

At present to each native regiment (as well as to each detached wing or squadron), besides one commissioned medical officer, one or generally two hospital assistants are attached for duty. These last receive a medical training in vernacular for three years—commence their duties on Rs. 20 a month—reaching the maximum of Rs. 80 during their service of thirty-two years. The commissioned (European) medical officer when in charge of a regiment commences with a minimum of Rs. 386 per month, plus on the average twelve per cent. on his pay as exchange compensation allowance. In a cavalry regiment he draws Rs. 65 in addition for horse allowance. The pay increases according to the length of service, and there is nothing to prevent him from holding the medical charge of a regiment for the entire period of his service. Thus, after twenty years' service he draws Rs. 1,000 per month—exclusive of allowances—for doing the same work for which he received Rs. 386 plus allowance when he joined the service. I submit there is no necessity for keeping up such an expensive system for the following reasons: The duties of a military medical officer are of two kinds. First, such as those that devolve upon him in cantonments and those that he is called upon to perform in war time. In cantonments the average daily sick in a regimental hospital is under four per cent. of the strength. That is, in a regiment of between 800 or 900 men the number of sick sepoys present in hospital rarely exceeds twenty or twenty-five. In a cavalry regiment the number is considerably less. The cases as a rule are mostly of a trivial nature, and can be easily treated by a properly qualified native assistant surgeon.

I consider it an unnecessary waste of money to pay Rs. 800 or 1,000 a month to look after twenty sick sepoys, most of whom are in hospital for very trifling complaints. As for the British officers attached to a native regiment, I would suggest that they and their families may be looked after by an officer of the army medical staff. Excepting in the Punjab frontier and Assam, there is always a detachment of British troops wherever native regiments are stationed. The army medical staff officer in medical charge of the British troops can for a small additional consideration look after the British officers and their families. On the Punjab frontiers there are generally two native regiments with a battery of artillery stationed at one place. The senior medical officer also performs the duties of the civil surgeon of the station. I would suggest that one army medical staff officer, with a sufficient number of native assistant surgeons, can perform all the duties just as well and far more inexpensively than what obtains at present.

As for the medical service in war time, it is admitted that the present arrangement is unsatisfactory. The greatest difficulty is experienced to obtain a sufficient number of medical officers. The only alternative is to engage a large number of commissioned medical officers for whom, as I have shown above, there is hardly any work during peace time. The remedy I would suggest is that a sufficient number of native military assistant surgeons may be trained in the country—paid on the scale of civil assistant surgeons, and who will perform all the professional duties—the administrative portion of them being left to experienced officers of the army medical staff. In place of the present system of imperfectly qualified hospital assistants and a limited number of very highly-paid commissioned medical officers, there will be a large number of properly qualified men who will for all practical purposes be quite equal to their duties during peace or war.

The present civil medical system is open to greater objection. A civil surgeon of a district is supposed to look after one or two hospitals at the headquarters of a district. Generally speaking, he is in charge of the district jail—not only as a medical officer but as its superintendent. He is the superintendent of vaccination for the district, as well as sanitary adviser to the head of the district. This by no means finishes the category of his duties. A lunatic asylum, a leper asylum, or a blind asylum, sometimes all three, are thrown in the lot. He is also responsible for the meteorological returns of his district. First, as to hospital work. At places like Benares, Agra, Lucknow, the civil surgeon is supposed to look after over 125 beds in the different hospitals scattered through the town; while at Jessore, Faridpur, Noakhali, the number of beds varies between ten and twelve. It will strike most people that 125 patients are more than what can be properly attended to by a single medical officer, and that looking after five or six patients in hospital is hardly exhaustive work for one medical man. But such is the curious anomaly of the system that not only the same emoluments are received by the two medical officers so differently situated, but the one who has almost nominal work to do can by the present arrangement draw more pay than his infinitely more hard-worked confrère. To do away with all these anomalies and for the better management of hospitals, I would suggest, and I believe the time has arrived to carry out the suggestion, that the system which, I understand, obtains in England may be partially adopted in India. There is a large number of properly qualified independent medical men trained in India as well as in Europe who will accept the post of honorary surgeons and physicians in the large hospitals at the headquarters of the provinces and districts. As to the fitness of the Indians to hold such appointments, I would point to the Campbell Hospital, Calcutta, to the comparative list of surgical operations performed by commissioned European medical officers and Indian civil assistant surgeons, as well as to the few Indian commissioned medical officers who have been permitted to hold civil appointments. In large towns there is generally a hospital for Europeans exclusively. At all these places there are highly qualified independent European medical practitioners who, I am sure, will be only too glad to offer their services gratuitously to such institutions. As for the hospitals for Indians, I would suggest the appointment of honorary physicians and surgeons may be left in the hands of the municipalities or other local bodies. All the hospitals suffer for want of funds. The Inspector-General of Civil Hospitals, North-Western Provinces, observes in his triennial report, ending 31st December, 1895 (page 20): "As a consequence of the want of means many civil surgeons not

only find the greatest difficulty in meeting the demands for the most ordinary and inexpensive medicines, but have also to defer or abandon the purchase of necessary instruments." Proper diet, which is such an important factor in the treatment of diseases, is supposed to be adequately supplied at the average cost of one anna per diet (page 55, N. W. P. Triennial Report, and page 93, Annual Report of the Dispensaries in the Punjab for 1895). At some places, such as Jhelum and Pind Dadan Khan, that modest amount is supposed to be quite large enough to meet the expenses of even two diets. When it is considered that the average famine diet costs about two annas per head, the sum expended in the nourishment of sick patients in the Indian hospitals cannot be open to the accusation of wanton waste. At the Ramsay Hospital at Naini Tal, which is a hospital for Europeans, the average cost of each diet is Rs. 3-0-9 (page 75, Triennial Report of the Dispensaries of North-West Provinces ending 1895), which shows what is supposed to be the proper expense for a sick diet, and the contrast between this diet and that allowed to the sick native of India is striking.

Such being the state of things, it is highly uneconomical to keep up a large number of military medical officers at an enormous cost. In some hospitals the pay alone of the commissioned medical officer comes up to more than the combined expenses of assistants, menial establishment, medicines, surgical instruments and dieting of all the hospitals and dispensaries of the entire district. As, for instance, the total expenditure during 1895 stood thus in the following districts in the North-Western Provinces:

Almora ..	Rs. 5,082- 2- 5 ..	P. 51 Trien. Rept., ending 1895
Dehra Dun ..	6,582- 1- 3 ..	P. 59 " "
Etwah ..	6,806-14-11 ..	P. 63 " "

If the above were in charge of a surgeon-captain his pay would come up to Rs. 6,600 a year, exclusive of exchange compensation allowance. By adopting the method here suggested there will be a considerable saving of expense.

FOREST DEPARTMENT (BENGAL).

There are 23 superior appointments in the Forest Department. With a single exception, they are all held by Europeans. The monthly salaries drawn by the European members of the Forest Service come up to Rs. 12,100; the salary drawn by the single Indian member of the Service is Rs. 300 a month. The Public Service recommended that "the staff should be divided into an Imperial and Provincial branches, and that, as in the Imperial Civil Service, the Imperial Branch of the Forest Service should be a *corps d'élite* limited to the number of officers necessary to fill the superior controlling appointments and such a proportion of the assistant conservators' posts as will ensure a complete training of the junior officers." They further recommended "that the Government should keep in view the policy of training in India men qualified to take charge of the higher administrative appointments, so as to avoid as far as possible the necessity for expanding the Imperial branch of the Service." From the facts stated above, it does not appear that any serious effort has been made to train natives of India so that they might take charge of the higher appointments, for, with one exception, these appointments are filled by Europeans.

THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICE (BENGAL).

The Educational Service in Bengal, which has recently been re-organized, has given rise to much dissatisfaction. Under the orders of the Secretary of State, "the Department is to be divided broadly into (a) the superior service, and (b) the subordinate service. The former will consist of two branches, one including all posts to be filled by persons appointed in England, which will be called "The Indian Educational Service," and the other including all posts to be filled by recruitment in India, which will be known as "The Provincial Educational Service." The Indian Educational Service will consist of 27 officers. The Provincial Service is to consist of 104 officers. The recruitment for the Indian Educational Service taking place in England, it need hardly be observed that natives of India will have little or no chance of appointment to the superior grade. Indeed, it would seem, from the orders of Government, that natives of India with degrees from the Universities of England, Scotland, and Ireland are now to be admitted only to the Provincial Service, for we find the following laid down in the scheme as sanctioned by the Secretary of State:—

The Provincial Educational Service is to consist of 104 officers, as follows:—

- 5 Inspectors of Schools.
- 10 Assistant Inspectors.
- 7 Principals and
- 51 Professors of Colleges.
- 24 Headmasters of Collegiate and Training Schools.
- 7 Others, including the (1) Assistant Superintendent and the (2) Headmaster of the School of Art; (3) the Personal Assistant to the Director of Public Instruction, and (4) supernumerary appointments (Professorships) to be filled by Indian gentlemen with degrees from the Universities of England, Scotland, and Ireland, or by Promohand Roychand students.

The concluding words of the extract which I have quoted supports the view which I have put forward, viz., that it appears to be the intention of the Resolution to confine the employment of Indians practically to the Provincial Service. There is absolutely no reason for this exclusion, when it is borne in mind that Indian gentlemen in the Educational Service with degrees from the English Universities have attained to the distinction which has been achieved by men like Dr. Bose and Dr. P. C. Roy. They are able to hold their own against any Englishman in the particular departments in which they have won distinction; but in future, under the operation of the new scheme, men like them will be relegated to the Provincial Service. It is, indeed, the case that the Government of Bengal itself is not satisfied with the scheme, inasmuch as the prospects of the officers in the lower grades are very discouraging and the scheme fixes the pay of the lower grade of the Provincial Service at Rs. 150 a month, while the pay of the lowest grade in the other Provinces appears to be higher. This is what Sir Alexander Mackenzie, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, observed in this connexion in his Resolution dated the 26th March, 1897: "His Honour observes that, owing to the narrowness of the scale of the Provincial Service, as compared with existing salaries, the prospects of officers in the lower classes are very discouraging. For instance, officers now placed in class VI on Rs. 250 of the Service, are all in class III (Rs. 200, 21, 300) of the existing Service, and before they can receive any increase of pay, they must rise to the top of class VI, and then move slowly to the top of class V. He also observes that the Provincial Services of other Provinces are practically devoid of class VIII on Rs. 150. Sir Alexander Mackenzie regrets this state of things, and, with a view to improving the prospects of the Provincial Service, he proposes at an early date to consider whether something may not be done by assigning a greater number of officers to some of the intermediate classes."

THE SURVEY DEPARTMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

The Public Service Commission, in their Report, observe that the admission to the junior division should not be confined to special classes of Her Majesty's subjects (evidently referring to the practical exclusion of Indians from the Provincial Service of the Department), but that it should be recruited by competition from among selected candidates (page 152, Public Service Commission's Report). In this Department there has always been considerable objection to the employment of Indians, as will be seen from the following memorandum written by Colonel De Pru, late head of the Survey Department, which was laid before the Public Service Commission: "I may here remark incidentally that my numerous late inspections show me that the tendency of the European surveyors is to stand and look on, while the natives are made to do the drawing and hand-printing, as if they thought themselves quite above that sort of thing. This is a mistake, and cannot be permitted for the future. Besides, it is suicidal for the Europeans to admit that natives can do any one thing better than themselves. They should claim to be superior in *everything*, and only allow natives to take a secondary or subordinate part.

"In my old parties I never permitted a native to touch a theodolite or an original computation, on the principle that the triangulation, or scientific work, was the prerogative of the highly-paid European; and this reservation of the scientific work was the only way by which I could keep a distinction, so as to justify the different figures respectively drawn by the two classes between the European in office time and the native who ran him so close in all the office duties as well as in the field

duties. Yet I see that natives commonly do the computation nowadays, and Europeans some other inferior duties."

The Public Service Commission also noted the objection to the employment of natives of India in their Report, and they observe:—"The Junior Division has been hitherto officered for the most part by Europeans domiciled in India and Eurasians, of whom many have passed the Matriculation Examination of the Indian Universities. . . . In the year 1884 the Government of India determined that natives should be employed in the Junior Division, believing that educated or trained natives could be found who were competent to perform all the duties of the subordinate staff, and that, as the competence of such natives had not been made the subject of trial, the presumption of incompetence could not be admitted (page 132).

But the fact seems to be forgotten that at one time the head of the Computing Department of the great Trigonometrical Survey was a Bengal gentleman (Baboo Radhanath Sikdar) who performed his duties with remarkable ability and efficiency. As it is we find that in the Survey Department, out of 119 appointments in the Provincial Service, only ten are held by Indians. The monthly salaries and allowances paid to European employees come up to Rs. 35,715, while the monthly salaries paid to Indian employees come up to Rs. 2,012. There is not a single Indian in the six grades of Extra Assistant Superintendents comprising appointments the salaries of which vary from Rs. 300 to Rs. 500 a month.

THE TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

There are in the Indian Telegraph Department eighty-two superior appointments, exclusive of the examiner and deputy examiner of accounts. All these appointments, with two exceptions, are held by Europeans, and by students passing from Cooper's Hill College. The monthly salaries drawn by the European employees come up to Rs. 56,025; the Indian member of the telegraph department, who is also a passed student of Cooper's Hill College, draws a monthly salary of Rs. 300. There is one other Indian member of the department, who is appointed on the Provincial scale of pay, and gets Rs. 150 a month. The Government of India resolved, on the recommendation of the Public Service Commission, to make some appointments to the telegraph service on the Provincial scale of pay, which is about 66 per cent. of the scale of English pay, from among the native students of the Thomson College, Roorkee (*vide* Government of India Resolution, No. 150, P.E., of 25th August, 1892, P.W.D.). Since the publication of this Resolution, twenty-one appointments have been made, out of which four have been made in India, and of the four, only one has been given to an Indian; the other three have been conferred on Eurasians. If the Government had exercised the powers which it assumed by the Resolution referred to above more largely, and the terms of which are quoted below,¹ there would have been a saving of expenditure, and a proportionate relief to the finances. The Thomson Engineering College is equipped for the purpose of turning out duly qualified candidates for the telegraph service. There seems to be little doubt that some of the Indian Colleges are turning out students whose services might with advantage be utilised for the telegraph and other scientific departments, with considerable relief to the public exchequer. Dr. J. C. Bose, Professor of Science in the Government Presidency College in Calcutta, who has acquired a European reputation by his discoveries in connexion with electrical science, thus observed, in a paper that he read in this country on the Progress of Science Teaching in India:—"The advanced students, whom we hope to train in our laboratories, will form the best material for recruitment to the various scientific departments under the State. The students who now work in electric science in our Presidency College laboratory acquire a very high efficiency in it, and it would be an advantage to the telegraph department to utilise their services. Indeed, this was at one time contemplated, and Sir Alfred Croft, the retiring Director of Public Instruction, interested himself in it. It is to be hoped that something will be done in this direction." If the hope expressed by Dr. Bose is fulfilled, a considerable impetus would be imparted to the teaching of

science in India, and the interests of economy would also be ensured. The Public Service Commission practically made the same recommendation. They recommended the gradual reduction of the staff recruited in England, and that a superior local telegraph service should be recruited in India from classes to be established at one or more of the Indian engineering colleges (p. 139).

There are 85 sub-assistant superintendents divided into two grades, 41 being in the first grade and 44 in the second grade. The maximum pay allowed in the first grade is Rs. 350 per mensem; in the second the maximum is Rs. 275 per mensem. There are only two Indians in these two grades. If the department were reorganised and native Indians employed more largely it would be possible to place it upon a more economical footing.

It would seem that all telegraph masters and signallers receive in addition to their substantive pay an allowance in the shape of house rent of Rs. 15 and 10 per month respectively when posted to Presidency towns and Rs. 10 and 5 respectively when employed in out-stations. But this rule does not apply to natives of India. In other words, it is only the European and Eurasian telegraph masters and signallers who are entitled to this privilege. In 1882 the Government of India in the Public Works Department issued the orders granting house allowance to all telegraph masters and signallers, with the exception, of course, of such as were provided with quarters. In 1883, orders were issued that native telegraph masters and signallers were not entitled to the allowance. Some native Christian signallers who had adopted the European mode of living prayed for this house allowance, when they received the following letter in reply:

From the Director-General of Telegraph.

To the Superintendent, Calcutta Office. No. 3375T,
dated, 26th September, 1890. Simla.

Sir,—With reference to your letter No. 2596T, dated the 16th of September, 1890, I have the honour to inform you that, under the orders of the Government of India, native signallers, as distinguished from European and Eurasian signallers, are not entitled to house allowance when not provided with quarters. By natives must be understood pure Asiatics, and the details of religion and dress that may be adopted by natives are questions which do not enter into the matter.

I am unaware of any special exceptions to this rule that may have been made in former years, but if such exceptions exist they afford no grounds for any further additions to them being made.

I have, etc.,

(Sd.) C. H. REYNOLDS,
Director Traffic Branch.

The house allowance granted to telegraph masters and signallers comes up to the sum of Rs. 7661 2 annas a month, or nearly a lakh of rupees a year. The details are given in the following statement:—

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

House allowance drawn by the Europeans and the Eurasian Signallers serving in the following telegraph divisions.

	Rs.	as.	p.
1. Bellary Division	37	8	0
2. East Coast	35	0	0
3. Madras	919	13	9
4. Bombay	2485	6	8
5. Nagpur	53	8	0
6. Rajputana	392	1	1
7. Sind and Belachistan	418	6	4
8. Punjab	416	0	0
9. Kashmir	342	5	8
10. Bengal	280	15	0
11. Arrakan	143	0	0
12. Lower Burmah	374	0	0
13. Upper Burmah	279	0	0
14. Calcutta	1,422	1	6
15. Ondh and Rohilkhand Division	62	0	0
16. Assam and Dacca Divisions			nil.
	7,661	2	0

¹ "The number of appointments shall ordinarily be two and one in alternate years, but these numbers may be varied according to the requirements of the department, due notice whereof will be given."

Because the signallers and the telegraph masters in these two divisions are provided with quarters—

1. Number of European and Eurasian Telegraph masters	Rs. 157	Ra.
2. Number of European and Eurasian signallers	1,145	
Total ..	1,302	1,302
Number of Native Telegraph masters	16	
Number of Native signallers	324	
Total ..	339	339
Grand Total ..	1,641	

No. 1 draw Rs. 15 and 7½ when posted to Presidency towns and mufussil respectively when not provided with quarters.

No. 2 draw Rs. 10 and 5 when posted to Presidency towns and mufussil respectively when not provided with quarters.

If all telegraph masters and signallers were natives, it is very obvious that under the existing rules the whole of this amount would be saved, and the saving would be in proportion to the employment of natives as telegraph masters and signallers. The distinction is invidious, and causes bitterness and ill-feeling between persons working in the same department and to the prejudice of public business.

A VISITOR TO THE CONGRESS.

Mr. George Harwood, who represents Bolton (Lancashire) in the House of Commons, was among the visitors to the recent Congress at Calcutta. Mr. Harwood, on his return, has described the Congress in a newspaper article, from which we extract the following. A reference to Mr. Harwood's article will also be found in "Indiana."

The Congress claims that its members come from deifferent parts of the country; that they are in close touch with the masses of the people, and that therefore they are often likely to know more of the feelings of those people than is possible to European officials. All that they ask is to place this knowledge at the service of those officials, and that due weight should be given to it.

The Indian Congress is certainly more representative than a Church Congress, of which anyone can become a member who chooses to buy a ticket; for only delegates can speak or vote, and these delegates have to be elected by the different Congress Circles throughout the country, in numbers proportionate to the membership roll of those Circles. Every delegate who attends the Congress has to pay ten rupees for his ticket, which is a fair measure of earnestness in so poor a country. In addition, most of the delegates pay their own travelling and other expenses; I talked with a number, and found that their attendance would cost them altogether sums varying from fifty to two hundred rupees, depending upon the place from which they had come, for distances are great in India. Of course, there is the largest muster from the neighbourhood of the place where the Congress happens to be held, and to meet this it is shifted to a different part of the country every year; but this year in Calcutta I spoke with a good many delegates who had come from the Punjab, Bombay, Madras, and even further south. Those who have experienced the joys of Indian railway travel, will understand the sacrifice of comfort involved, to say nothing of the money cost.

Perhaps the most interesting part of my experience was attending—three days beforehand—a meeting of the Committee which had to discuss the subjects to be brought before the Congress. Unlike our Church Congress—of which the programme is crystallised before by the local Committee—this Congress leaves its subjects to be settled by the members themselves; and, as these cannot meet from such great distances except a few days before the gathering, it follows that the arrangements have to be put together in a hurry. Indeed, there is a meeting each evening to settle the next day's work,

but the general outline is fixed by the Committee, which I attended. What an interesting assembly it was, merely to look at! If not "Parthians and Medes and Elamites," at any rate there were Hindus and Muhammadans from all parts of India. And what wonderful manners they all have; so polite and bright and engaging! And what still more wonderful English they all speak! Perhaps the most astonishing feature of this Congress is that all its proceedings are conducted in a language which is foreign to all the speakers, as if the Church Congress was carried on in French or German. The comparison makes one marvel at the intellectual versatility of these people, even though one cannot help smiling at the curious style of their speech; a style combining the subtlety of Mr. Gladstone with the sententiousness of Dr. Johnson.

The Congress itself was a very picturesque and impressive sight. No gathering of five or six thousand Eastern people could help being picturesque; especially when it is considered that they had come from all parts of the great continent, and were got up in their "Sunday best." The President's turban was a study in itself; what ladies would call, "a sweet thing in green and pink and gold"; and this was only one amongst hundreds of varieties. Then the structure in which the Congress was held was likewise a picture; a sort of bamboo temple, without sides, the roof being supported by pillars which were ingeniously festooned to look like palms. Of course, there were the usual flags, only more of them; and a host of gaily-attired stewards, with white wands, symmetrically dispersed over the building, gave a character to the scene. There were about a thousand deputies, seated in groups "according to nations," as the old phrase expressed it; the rule being that those who had come farthest sat nearest, whilst the people of the place had the worst seats. Beyond the deputies were the general public, numbering about five thousand, I should say, who all paid for admission, and had seats accordingly, the prices for some of them being low, but for most of them being high, according to Indian ideas.

The President was a Muhammadan, a lawyer of Bombay, who has held high office, and has certainly all the marks of a well-bred and kindly gentleman.

The Congress was opened by the singing of two odes by a choir of men dressed in white. I suppose I must call it music, though that is not the word I should have chosen, unless I had remembered that ideas on such matters are so various. One of the most striking things in India is that one so seldom hears amongst the people even any attempt at music, and such attempts seem to result only in monotonous wails. Perhaps, though, one would have thought the same of the strains which so moved the ancient Greeks; indeed, this is certain if what we hear in modern Greece is any guide. At any rate, no objection could be made to the sentiment of their odes, as will be seen from the translation of a verse from each, which runs thus:—

"Let not applause be your sole aim,
Nor let abuse your soul subdue;
Devote your life to what is good,
And what is great, and what is true."

and

"Sons of India! sing the glory
Of the land that gave you birth;
Slug with heart and soul accorded,
Of her greatness and her worth."

Then came an address of welcome by the chairman of the Reception Committee, a Knight, who had been a judge of the High Court, and a member of the Imperial Council; and this was followed by the President's address. Both of these were much too long, according to our ideas; indeed, the President, after reading away for several hours, had to give up from sheer exhaustion. Swift's method of ruling out every other word would have greatly improved both their speeches, but would not have been half drastic enough. Both speakers, as, indeed, all the speakers of the Congress who touched on the topic, were full of praise of "the enlightened and essentially just Government under which we live"; both also protested, again and again, that "we offer help, but no menace, to that Government."

The list of topics discussed did not include many new subjects, for the Congress is now in its twelfth year, and so has roamed pretty well over its possible field. The present condition of the country, of course, made the Famine a pro-

minent subject, and the Congress decided that the true remedy against a recurrence is "the adoption of a policy which would enforce economy, husband the resources of the State, and foster the development of indigenous industries which have practically been extinguished." It seems to me that both England and India have a serious lesson to learn from these famines; England, that her government, whilst very good, is also very costly for such a poor country; India, that she must somehow teach her people not to populate so close to the line of starvation. I ventured to point this out to a number of the leading members whom I met at lunch. Of course, it is a delicate subject, surrounded by a labyrinth of religious prejudices and social customs; but there is no hope for India unless the population can somehow be diminished. Our responsibility in the matter is great, since by our systems of relief we counter-act nature's effective—though cruel—method of rectifying the errors of men.

Another subject discussed was the old one of separating the Judicial from the Executive functions. This change has been advocated by many of the ablest of the Anglo-Indian officials, and is undoubtedly supported by reason, as well as by our well-known maxim that the accuser should never be also the judge. Perhaps the Congress might well address itself to the practical objections which are made to the change; such as that it would increase the expense of government, and diminish its efficiency.

The Congress got its blood up about the new education scheme which has just been sanctioned by the Secretary of State, because it seems to confine natives to the provincial service, and shuts them out from the higher grades. I think this must be a misunderstanding; as a Government which admits natives to the highest positions in the law can hardly exclude them from any other branch.

A resolution was passed that the examinations for Government employment should be held simultaneously in England and India. The upper-class Hindu has a tremendous belief in examinations, and a tremendous desire for a Government post. Of course, it is invidious to have to point out to him that no examiner has ever yet discovered a test for those qualities of character which have more to do than any knowledge with the fitness to govern; but the Congress seemed to recognise the difficulty, for it did not ask that positions should be assigned regardless of race, but only that a certain number should be reserved for natives.

The Congress condemned the severity of the Salt Tax, asking that the duty should be restored to its level of 1868; and it also again raised its plea for the extension of trial by jury, claiming that the progress of education has made a sufficient number of suitable persons available in all parts of the country. Perhaps it went too far in asking that the verdicts of such juries should be final; for it is not the education of the jurymen which is in question, but his justice and courage.

The question was raised of whether the Universities ought not to admit their graduates to a larger share of power, and resolutions were proposed in favour of the establishment of technical schools and agricultural parks. It was also urged that the settlement of the land question, which has been fixed in certain parts of the country, should be made permanent and extended to the other parts; and the Congress reaffirmed its contention that the Medical Service ought to be reformed, so as to give a better chance to native talent. The Government was called upon to secure proper treatment for the Indian subjects who emigrate to South Africa; and was asked to grant greater concessions for obtaining arms in districts where destructive animals abound.

Other matters were raised with which I need not trouble you; and I will only add that no resolution was allowed to be brought forward unless the Subjects Committee was practically unanimous about it, and that every resolution was carried by the Congress without opposition, and most of them amidst loud cries of "All! All!" Whatever else may be thought about this Congress, every Englishman must feel that it is at least a very interesting instance of that which is said to be the sincerest form of flattery. Most thoughtful Englishmen who know anything of India will also allow that our present system of governing that country cannot go on for ever, just as it is, and that this Congress may perhaps suggest certain wise directions of change.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI IN EDINBURGH.

A public meeting was held on April 28th in the Literary Institute, Edinburgh, to hear an address by Mr. H. M. Hyndman on "The Coming Collapse of British Rule in India." Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji presided. We take the following brief report from the *Scotsman*, which estimated the number present at 700.

"Mr. Naoroji in taking the chair, expressed his obligation to the Edinburgh branch of the Social Democratic Federation. He did not, however, stand there as belonging to any section of British politics, but solely and simply as an Indian—(applause)—appealing to the British public on behalf of his country. They were met to consider the disastrous events that were occurring in India. They were always told, and there was some truth in it, that British rule had done some good in India, but they must consider whether that good had been sufficient to counterpoise the many evils to which India had been subjected under the same rule. He spoke of the present famine, also of the plague, and of the wars that had already done evil, and said the fact that the condition of India was such to-day, after nearly one hundred and fifty years of regular British administration, was a thing which it was very necessary for the British public to consider. He knew very well, and it had been his faith during the past forty years, that the British public wicked India should be governed on righteous and honourable principles. (Applause.) They had at present a very sympathetic feeling exhibited by the British public in the circumstance that they had already collected at the Mansion House over half-a-million, and that at other places the amount collected also amounted to a large sum; but whether that sum was small or large, the Indians were equally grateful. The question was not only how to get over the present famine, but, what was important to the British name as well as to India, they should understand why there should be any famine at all there. (Applause.) If droughts under exigencies of climate should take place, it did not follow that because there was a drought or short crop there should be a famine sufficiently dreadful to carry away millions of their fellow-subjects. (Applause.) Proceeding to give a short sketch of the underlying principles of British rule in India, he said that the spirit of the whole administration at the first was pure selfishness, carried out in the most rapacious manner possible. Gradually a system was formed by which a regular drain of wealth from India to Britain began, and at the present time the amount of the drain was perhaps ten, twelve, or fifteen times the three millions a year it was at an earlier date. During the past eighteen years, from the time when the last famine took place up to the present day, the drain of wealth from India had been something like 400 or 500 millions sterling—"Shame"—and they, therefore, must not blame Indians if they said that the present famine collection was not worthy of the British people and the British name. (Applause.) But in their dire condition they were grateful for it. Oppressed and kept down as they were, he went on to state, they were deteriorating in intellect, wealth, and work, but that, up to the present time was not the fault of the masses of the British people. It was for the British people to restore to righteousness what had been for the past 150 years an unrighteous rule. Those famines would never be prevented if the administration in the name of the British public was to go on in the same way as it was at the present time conducted. Not only on the principle of righteousness, but on the low principle of selfishness, it was to the best interests of Britain and of India that India should be righteously governed. After stating that there were 300 millions of people in India, and arguing that the trade with India might, if the country were righteously governed, be so increased that the word 'unemployed' might be erased from British dictionaries, he said they could understand that if they continued to bleed a person or a nation, that person or country must in time die. If, however, there was a peaceful revolution of the principles upon which the Indian Government was at present conducted, Britain and India would both be blessed. (Applause.)

"Mr. Hyndman, in the course of his address, said that Britain was crushing down in every possible way the rights of the people over whom she had control.

"Mr. D. Blackburn moved:—'That this meeting of citizens of Edinburgh, in view of the terrible famine caused by the drain of produce from India to England of not less than thirty million sterling a year, without commercial return, calls upon the Government to stop this drain now, and henceforth to substitute native administration, under British supervision, for the present wholesale Europeanisation in every department.'

"The resolution was seconded by Mr. John Bain, supported by Mr. Mullick, a native of India, and adopted."

Commenting on Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's speech, the *Greenock Telegraph* (April 27th) wrote, in a leading article entitled "Draining India":—

"The public of Great Britain have often been dazzled by gaudy rhetoric; and no tinsel phrase has more tickled the popular palate than the one which tells us that India is the brightest jewel in Britannia's Imperial Crown. We have all read many a time of the wealth of India, of the enormously rich rajahs, of the magnificence of the Delhi and Lucknow bazars, of the fertile fields of Bengal, and the opulence of the far-famed pearl fisheries. The picture-books and Sunday School magazines of our youth familiarised us with the idea of luxury, the turbaned and somnolent chiefs, riding on richly-caparisoned elephants, the great marble palaces of Agra, the costly idols of Benares, and even the simple ryot living in peace and plenty under his mango tree. But this, it seems, however real it once was, is now largely a picture of imagination. That there are still piles of wealth in Madras, Calcutta, and Bombay, countless diamonds and precious stones of inestimable value in such old cities as Delhi and Lahore, and no end of rich rajahs and nawabs, goes without saying. But what of the condition of India as a whole? There are very many authorities who still maintain that the conquest and administration of Hindostan last century has proved a blessing to the teeming millions of many races and many sects; that but for the military genius and energy of the Anglo-Saxon race from the days of Clive onward, the soft and pliable Hindus would long before now have been conquered by some other hardihood—either the Tartars and Afghans, or the hordes of Muscovites from Asiatic Russia. And the argument is that, if India was destined to be held in subjection at all, better far that her rulers should be the enlightened, highly Christianised and just British, than the wolfish Afghans and the hill tribes, or the sly ever self-seeking Russian Bear. But the question is, has the lapse of time proved that argument to be true? Many of our most thoughtful and just public men are asking themselves, has Britain acted fairly and honourably towards her great Empire in the East? We all know the infamous exactions of Warren Hastings, the wicked despoiling of the Princesses of Oude, and the official lootings of Delhi and other populous cities. But that is not what the present critics of British administrators of India are thinking of. The story of Warren Hastings, and the other 'old Indians' of John Company, is a closed book. The point is, How has Britain governed India since the era of the Mutiny? Has England—because the policy is always dictated from London—played once more the part of the conscienceless blood-sucker, as some say she does towards Ireland and Scotland? Speaking in Edinburgh last night, an Indian, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, ex-member of the British Parliament, made several sweeping accusations against this country's rule in India. He declared that 'the spirit of the whole administration at the first was pure selfishness, carried out in the most rapacious manner possible; and he laid this down as a fact that during the past eighteen years, from the time when the last famine took place up to the present day, the drain of wealth from India had been something like 400 or 500 millions sterling.' What, asked Mr. Naoroji, was a dole of half-a-million or even a million of famine fund to this enormous and systematic drain of money from the Indian peninsula to the British islands. 'It was for the British people,' said Mr. Naoroji, 'to restore to righteousness what had been for the past 150 years an unrighteous rule.' This way of putting the Indian question will surprise most people. One thing, if India has been plundered, it has

not been by the masses of Great Britain and Ireland, but by the Anglo-Saxon ruling classes, who have for centuries past done a tolerable amount of thieving at home."

"A RETIRING CIVILIAN."

MR. F. H. SKRINE "TAKES THE PUBLIC INTO HIS CONFIDENCE."

Some interest and a good deal of amusement have been excited in India by a farewell letter addressed to a Calcutta journal named *Capital* by Mr. F. H. Skrine, a member of the Indian Civil Service on the point of resignation. The following account of Mr. Skrine appears in the "India List" for the current year:—

SKRINE, Francis Henry Bennet, Indian C. S. (Bengal).—Educ. at Blackheath Proprietary Sch.; apptd. after exam. of 1868; arrived 22nd Nov., 1870, and served as asst. mag. and collr. in Bengal; on famine relief duty 1874 and 1877-78 (in Madras); Supt. of Salem Central jail, Jan., 1878; joint mag. and dep. collr. May, 1884; mag. and collr. Aug., 1887; off. commr., Bhagalpur, 1893-94; collr. of customs, Calcutta, Oct., 1895.

The following is taken from Mr. Skrine's letter:—

SIR,—Since your contemporary the *Freeman* announced last month that I was about to resign the Civil Service I have received innumerable letters from friends anxious to know why I have adopted so crucial a course. It is due to my colleagues and to the people of this province that I should, to a certain extent, take them into my confidence at this crisis. I will do no more than allude here to my private grievances, for the Press has never been used by me as a vehicle for representing them. There exist constitutional channels for that purpose, of which I will not fail to take advantage. In this communication I will confine myself to causes which affect the whole body of my colleagues, and, therefore, indirectly, the millions for whose happiness they are responsible.

A SMALL DOMINANT CASTE.

It is the fashion with Viceroys on returning to ease and dignity, and with Secretaries of State, to eulogise the Covenanted Civil Service; and, indeed, everyone who is aware of the adverse conditions under which its task is performed must admire the fortitude and the sense of public duty which animate the units composing it. But of corporate life this Service no longer possesses a spark, and the attempts made of late years to galvanise it into collective action have resulted only in the evolution of a particularly hideous blazer. It began to die with the extinction of Haileybury; for what *esprit de corps* can there be in so heterogeneous a body, while social distinctions and pride of birth are still so strong amongst us? The process of destruction has been hastened by the gradual formation of a small dominant caste which has grown out of the complexity of official work, the weakness of our rulers, and the annual migration to hill stations. Now, the advantages of life on those breezy heights are enormous. Those who are privileged to enjoy it have a climate and scenery superior to those of England. (See the trenchant remarks of Sir Henry Cunningham, who alone of the members of the Indian Finance Commission had the courage to raise his voice against the injustice of the exodus.) They have a numerous and varied society to count on, and domestic surroundings more sumptuous, while they are more cheaply purchased than those at the command of the middle classes in Europe. And all these advantages are monopolised by them with pension rules and salaries calculated to preserve health and counter-balance the great inconvenience of life in the plains. A divisional commissioner, for instance, has duties as onerous as those of any secretary, with a far larger share of responsibility, and yet he must spend at least a quarter of his income on ice, punkahs, leave, often on sick certificate, and on maintaining a separate establishment for his wife and children in the hills or at home. As to leave, what secretary is there

who does not avail himself of every month to his credit? . . . There is no fetish about Secretariat work. It is very often of a slipshod quality; and I could pick up many grammatical holes in Government resolutions as Cobbett did in poor King George III.'s speeches from the throne.

"FEROCIOUS SELF-SEEKING."

The ferocious self-seeking, the postponement of public to private interests which are now so rampant, are subjects of remark with all who read the newspapers. The *Pioneer*, which is certainly not open to the imputation of being "agin Government," animadverted lately on the nimbleness with which high officials skipped from province to province, regardless of the necessity that exists for maintaining a continuous administrative policy. This dominant caste is kept together by a tacit understanding that outsiders shall never break their ranks. A lieutenant-governor (or a chief commissioner) is often uncomfortably aware that his secretaries "know too much," and, as he can assimilate only such official provender as he receives from them, he is always very much in their hands. Hence it is within the power of secretaries to suppress the work of possible rivals, to misrepresent their character, to stab their reputation. An eminent subordinate of the Government of India, who has lately retired, said, when the tactics of a colleague notorious for that kind of thing, were canvassed in his presence: "Yes, but you know a successful secretary must be a bit of a snake!"

I have enlarged, perhaps, sufficiently on the humiliation inflicted on the vast majority of the Civil Service by their exclusion from all the sweets of office. The surroundings in which the "submerged nine-tenths" are forced to live are to the last degree depressing. To tell the story of the decay of social life and the deterioration of physical environment in Lower Bengal would carry me too far. Their ruinous effect is enhanced by the frequent transfers which are the rule; and by the absence of proper house accommodation. I have five times been compelled to set up home in twice as many years; and on each occasion I have lost heavily on the sale of my effects. So complete is the absence nowadays of *esprit de corps* that one's successors rarely purchase any large proportion of one's household furniture. A divisional commissioner (not my successor, I am glad to say) lately refused to take over a single stick of his predecessor's, who was driven to the ignominious expedient of raffling his horses and carriages. . . .

WHAT BENGAL WANTS.

Unfavourable surroundings and the immense growth of harassing routine work have reacted most disastrously on the administration. Scarcely anything is done to develop the natural resources of the province or rescue the seething masses of semi-barbarians from the grasp of the village Shylock. What Bengal, indeed, wants, is not the cadastral surveyor, the law-giver, or even the schoolmaster, but the civil engineer. She cries for drainage in the fever-haunted central districts. The Rajapore scheme, one of the few carried out during the last ten year, pays 20 per cent., and I could point to scores of better ones. She cries for pure water, bridges, and roads everywhere. In the Chittagong district there are millions of acres of deep loam covered with jungle; while Behar and the Santal Perganas cannot maintain their population. And how utterly erroneous is our whole educational system! A late High Court judge once remarked to me that the Secretariat and the Education Department were the two *vera tongues* of the Civil Service. He said that the "schoolmasters" from England who, in point of birth and attainments, were not at all behind civilians, found themselves branded as "uncovenanted," and the bitterness and jealousy thus engendered reacted strongly on their teachings. And we have given the disaffected throughout the peninsula a *lingua franca* in which to communicate their hopes and plottings. Yearly do our schools and colleges convert thousands of youths who would have been happy and useful at the paternal plough-tail into abject office-seekers of sullen Adullamites. The rich and beautiful vernaculars have been shamefully neglected. The whole provincial allotment for fostering them is, I believe, Rs. 10,000 annually. District technical education, which I laboured so hard to promote eight years ago, is persistently discouraged.

It is now almost too late to seek an effectual remedy for abuses so inveterate. I would, however, suggest that some

good might be effected by the conversion of the Board of Revenue into an executive council. I mean no disrespect to my old friends who are, for the moment, guiding the destinies of that venerable craft; but the truth must be said. It is costly, cumbrous, and antiquated; while, as it is frequently in conflict with the Lieutenant-Governor, it is a source of positive weakness. . . .

THE SIMLA "EXODUS."

And what shall I say of the annual migration to Simla, which has been imitated by provincial Governments of all degrees? It is an abuse which has been endured only because it has grown imperceptibly, and so many are interested in maintaining it. That it should have sucked the life blood of the administration for thirty years will not be credited by our successors a generation hence. If only for the sake of public morality, toleration should no longer be extended to the almost universal craving to avoid the inconveniences of a residence in the plains. What a spectacle does this blunted sense of public duty on the part of scores of high officials afford to the people of India! Few who have not repeatedly visited Simla, as I have done, are aware of the extent of the evil. I have taken the trouble to count in the Simla directory the number of European and Eurasian subordinates of the Government of India alone who summer there. It is precisely 444, and this in addition to perhaps three times the number of babus who are dragged there annually much against their will, and consoled for chattering teeth and being packed like herrings by handsome "hill allowances." The gross cost to the State of the flittings to half a score of sanitarium must be something enormous; but the skilful juggling in the annual accounts baffles the too curious inquirer.

Now, I am not an opponent *quand même* of the Simla exodus. It is vain to point to Cornwallis and Wellesley toiling for years in the swamps, for had they possessed a European climate within a few hours of Calcutta they would not have been content with Government House and Baranpore. I think that viceroys, lieutenant-governors, and their advisers, on whom depend such vital interests, are entitled to the best and healthiest surroundings procurable. But what claim have such departments as those in the following list to bury themselves for three-fourths of the year in the bowels of the Himalayas?

Superintendent of Thuggee and Dacoity.
Inspector-General of Imperial Service Troops.
Military Accountant-General.
Ordnance Department.
Commissionary-General.
Examiner of Military Works Accounts.
Director, Military Works.
Accountant-General, Military Department.
Meteorological Department.
Surveyor-General Department.
Remount Agency.
Veterinary Department.
Postal Department.
Telegraph Department.

It is very clear that the heads of these branches of the administration would be much better employed for nine months of the year in tours of inspection; while their office establishments would be more appropriately located at Calcutta, Allahabad, or Poona. Whenever this great official Babylon has burst on my view, its hillside studded with buildings devoted to the secretaries and erected at a cost out of proportion even to their enormous bulk, my mind's eye has called up those annexes of the chateau of Versailles which dwarf the palace itself. Here, under the old *regime*, the entire public business of France was concentrated. To the baleful bureaucracy which tenanted them was due the paralysis which fell on the kingdom in 1792 and led to the awful excesses of the Reign of Terror.

Next in importance is a reform in the Secretariat, whose exclusive privileges have taken the heart out of the Civil Service, even as those of Napoleon the Third did out of the French army.

Secretaries must no longer be allowed to monopolise honours, pleasure, and profit, or to "run with the hare and hunt with the hounds." They should be given the option of working on salaries and leave rules similar to those which are maintained in the home Civil Service, or of taking their share of

the burden and heat of the day in the plains. Promotion to posts requiring statesmanship, such as those of lieutenant-governor and chief commissioner, should be given only to men who have passed through all stages of practical administrative work. A knowledge of mankind can never be attained by those whose duties throughout their career have been clerical, or at best literary. Such men remain doctrinaires to the end, and are either inert or mischievously active as administrators.

A PARTING GIFT OF—ADVICE.

And now, sir, you will perhaps permit me to offer a few words of advice by way of farewell to my native friends. . . . To those who desire to raise their countrymen from the slough in which they are content to wallow I would say:—Try to infuse a little more brightness and colour into the social life around you. It is incredible how dull is existence in the mofussil! . . . Encourage technical education as some relief to the eternal literary cram which is doing such vast mischief by its universality. So shall you, perchance, revive the cunning of hand and eye which made your ancestors so famous, and that artistic sense which has been killed by ages of philistinism. Use the precious years of British peace, not to conspire and complain against a Government which is the most honest the world has ever seen, but to set your own house in order, to purge your domestic surroundings of barbarism, to elevate your women, and to instil courage and bodily health into the young by promoting manly sports. There is no precedent in history for the growth of a national existence in a community of doctrinaires and bookworms. The world is for the strong, and every race ultimately gets the Government which it deserves.

THE PENALTY OF VIRTUE.

Such are the principles which, throughout my whole career, I have preached and practised. If these last words of mine sink deeply into the hearts of those who read them, I shall have done more for India by rendering it possible that I should say them publicly than by continuing to serve the State. With many shortcomings, alas, I have tried to do my duty; and if I have raised enemies in a class far too numerous in India, which resents energy and self-reliance as a reflection on their own smug mediocrity, I have, at least, the reward of my own conscience, and the inward certainty that time will do my memory justice.

Quod mihi viventi detraxerit invida turba
Post obitum duplici fenore reddet honore.

Calcutta, April 13, 1897.

F. H. SKRINE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1897.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. "The Queen's Own Guides Corps in India."

CHURCH MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCER. Weitbricht, Rev. Dr., "Itineration in Lyallpur, Punjab."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Symonds, William Alfred, "The Palmyra and its Uses." Rogers, Alex., "The Famine in India." "Dr. J. C. Bose on Electric Waves." Muthu, Dr. Chowry, "The Science of Health."

MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD: Chamberlain, Dr. Jacob, "Hinduism as It Is."

MONIST. Carrus, Dr. Paul, "The Mythology of Buddhism."

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Dufferin and Ava, Marquis of, "How India fights the Famine."

QUIVER. Woolmer, D. L., "Child Wives and Child Widows in India."

ST. MARTIN'S-LE-GRAND. Ferard, A. G., "With the Indian Mail from London to Bombay."

SCOTTISH REVIEW. "Lord Roberts in India."

SUNDAY MAGAZINE. Preston, William C., "The Holy Land of India."

UNITED SERVICE MAGAZINE. "Cordite Manufacture in India."

YOUNG MAN. Clark, F. E., "The Famine at Short Range."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1897.

COWELL, E. B. AND THOMAS, F. W. . . . "The Harsha-
Carita of Bana." (The Royal Asiatic Society) — —

CROOKE, W., Bengal Civil Service (Retired)
"The North-Western Provinces of India."
(Methuen) 10s. 6d.

SCOUTTAR, ROBINSON, M.P. "Glimpses of
our Empire." (Hodder and Stoughton) . . . 1s. 6d.

MACLEAN, JAMES MACKENZIE, M.P. "A Guide
to Bombay." (Street and Co.) Rs. 5.

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPORTS AND PAPERS:—

[66.] EAST INDIA (OPIUM)—Return of Opium Statis-
tics, 1885-86 to 1894-95 0s. 1d.

[88.] EAST INDIA—Return relating to the Extension
of Railways by Private Agency 0s. 3d.

[110.] EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE)—Re-
turn of the Net Income and Expenditure of
British India for the eleven years from 1885-
86 to 1895-96; with Appendices 0s. 7d.

HOUSE OF COMMONS BILLS:—

[185.] EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPER-
ANNUATION—Bill to remove doubts as to the
power of the Secretary of State in Council of
India to grant Superannuation and Com-
pensation Allowances in certain cases to
Officers on his Establishment 0s. 1d.

PAPERS BY COMMAND:—

[8338.] TRADE OF BRITISH INDIA—Tables relating to
the Trade of British India with British
Possessions and Foreign Countries for the
five years 1891-92 to 1895-96 0s. 9½d.

[8347.] PRISON-MADE GOODS (INDIA)—Correspon-
dence between the Board of Trade and the
India Office, and between the India Office
and the Indian Government, on the subject of
Prison-made Goods 0s. 1½d.

[8376.] "WARREN HASTINGS," WRECK OF—Reports,
etc., relative to the Wreck of the Indian
Transport "Warren Hastings," on the 14th
January, 1897 0s. 3d.

[8379.] EAST INDIA (CONTAGIOUS DISEASES), No. 1
(1897)—Report of a Departmental Committee
on the Prevalence of Venereal Disease among
the British Troops in India; with Tables
and Appendices. (With Chart) 0s. 6½d.

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of
Magdalen College, and Secretary of the Appoint-
ments Committee in the University of Oxford, acts as
Guardian to persons coming to England for Education,
and gives information as to the methods available of
Education, General and Professional. Address Secretary,
INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools),
44, High Street, Oxford, England.—(Advt.)

Printed by A. BOWEN, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for
the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 24 and 25,
Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, E.W.]

VOL. VIII., No. 7.
(NEW SERIES.)

JULY, 1897.

[Subscription, Post Free,
Six Shillings PER ANNO,
IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indians: Notes on Indian Affairs	193	Alexander the Great	211
Lord Roberts's Second Thoughts, by J. Dacosta ..	199	Indian Delegates in England: Important Campaign in the Constituencies	212
The Indian Budget, by D. E. Wacha	202	Lord G. Hamilton and the Indian Delegates	216
Land Revenue Settlement in Madras, by G. Subramania Iyer	204	India and the "Diamond Jubilee"	218
"Conciliation or Litigation"	206	Anglo-Muhammadian Law	220
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects ..	208	A Strong-Minded Hindu. II., by W. Martin Wood ..	221
Recent Official Publications	208	Correspondence: "The Ancient Monuments of India" ..	223
Some Lessons of the Famine	209		

Indiana.

FAMINE, plague, earthquake, and an impending renewal of war in Waziristan might have been expected to attract public attention to India in the midst of the recent "Jubilee" celebrations. While the rest of the British Empire, except Ireland, rejoices, India is plunged in mourning. Yet the British Government and the British public apparently see no reason to turn aside for a moment from the "perpetual cataract of congratulation" in order to pay heed to the claims put forward by Indian public opinion, and to grant some slight concession which might serve to render the year notable in Indian annals for something besides an appalling series of calamities. The suggestions made by Indians resident in the United Kingdom in their address to her Majesty the Queen, and by Sir W. Wedderburn in his letter to the *Times*, have, so far as one can see, produced no practical result whatever. And while no steps were taken to secure an adequate representation of India at the "Jubilee" celebrations themselves, even the guests that came were treated in a way which, compared, for example, with the honours done (and rightly done) to the Colonial Premiers, can hardly be regarded as creditable. Yet public opinion at home is by no means free from apprehension with regard to India—as witness the significant, though absurd, readiness to assume a political basis for every supposed symptom of unrest, whether it be smearing of

mango trees or an act of fanaticism like the deplorable assassination of Lieutenant Ayerst.

THE news that Mr. Dadabhai Sir M. M. Bhow-Naoroji has secured the distinction of K.C.I.E. for Mr. M. M. Bhow-naggee will hardly have excited much surprise in India. Something of the sort was fully expected, and had been more than once foreshadowed in our columns. We say that the distinction is ultimately due to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji because, of course, nobody in his senses imagines that Anglo-Indian Toryism would have been at the pains to introduce Mr. Bhow-naggee to public notice, if it had not been thought necessary to provide a counterblast, however feeble, to the inconvenient contentions which Mr. Naoroji has put forward with untiring industry and with so much success. When the Primrose League regales a free and independent electorate with tea and strawberries and brass bands, the intelligent observer attributes the hospitality not, of course, to the party which the Primrose League serves, but to the party which armed the electorate with the franchise. The victims of the hospitality are none the less to be pitied, and nobody, we imagine, will envy the agent of the India Office the badge which he has obtained. Sir Wilfrid Lawson has made the cruel suggestion that reasons should be stated when public decorations are conferred. It would be superfluous to enquire what are the services which have been recognised in the case of Mr. Bhow-naggee. One cannot recognise what does

not exist. Was it not Lord Melbourne who said that he liked the Garter because it was not mixed up with any damned nonsense about merit? The India Office has merely confessed its obligations, and shown its hand. Fortunately no Congress-wallah need apply when decorations are being given away. The purity of the Congress party is not menaced by these temptations. If anything were needed to persuade lovers of their country of the vanity of titles, this latest escapade would suffice to do it. Let us admit, however, that the Tories, whatever else may be said or thought of them, are not afraid to reward (even at the risk of ridicule) those whom they see to be with them. But what is one to think of the unspeakable stupidity which in the last Parliament prevented Liberals in office from conciliating the great body of public opinion in India? The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. Need it be added that they are immeasurably wiser than some Liberal Secretaries of State?

A PERUSAL of the text of Sir James Westland's financial statement only serves to confirm the views we had occasion to express on the telegraphic summary of it in our April number. In view of the forthcoming discussion in the House, however, there are one or two points that invite further remark, partly by way of insistence, partly by way of expansion—notably the famine and the question of the provincial contracts. Meantime a believer in portents might well regard the outlook as ominous. Upon the famine and the plague there has followed an earthquake, causing widespread destruction and dislocation. Border troubles have been renewed by an outbreak of "tribal treachery," provoked of course by insensate aggressiveness. Why, in the name of sense and reason, should we parade our troops in the face of the untamed tribesmen of the frontier? What else can be expected from them? What, especially, can a nation that prides itself on liberty and independence expect from mountaineers that have never known actual subjection? Anyhow, here we are again fitting out a punitive expedition to chastise the recalcitrant tribesmen of the Tochi valley. So the vicious circle goes round, and the charges accumulate on the distressed exchequer at Calcutta. And meantime, also, there is the incredible folly of neglecting to invite any single native Indian prince to take part in his public capacity in the Jubilee celebrations in London. It is the acme of political fatuity.

Militarism and the Famine. THERE is at least one cause for qualified satisfaction in connexion with the famine, and that is the general feeling that, in spite of its unparalleled area,

it has, on the whole, been tackled with more efficiency and success than were displayed in the case of former visitations. When all has been said that ought to be said against the preliminary obstructions, hesitations, and unreadiness of officialism, this result ought to be liberally acknowledged. There will probably be little disposition to haggle with the Indian Government over the expenditure. The important thing, undoubtedly, is that the lesson should be laid to heart frankly; and the main ground of censure—so far as one can see at present—lies in the Government's limited attention to the means of prevention that were amply set before it, not merely by obnoxious critics, but in the report of the last Famine Commission. We have already expressed approval of the expansion of the railway system, in so far as it practically meets the necessities of relief in a time of scarcity or famine; although we do at the same time question gravely the expediency of railway building even for commercial or social convenience, beyond the immediately available resources of the treasury or of the country. The irrigation system, in a financial point of view, has proved very discouraging, it must be admitted. Yet it is quite an essential part of the preventive organisation, and should be judiciously extended in the future. On both these sides there is something to the credit of the Government. On the other hand, there are points, apparently of the most obviously fundamental nature, that the Government had neglected lamentably, and with deplorable results. The main reason for such neglect is on the surface; it is the essential reason of the financial difficulty—the insane military expenditure, especially on frontier expeditions, which has kept the treasury in a chronic state of depletion. The first line of defence against famine is the ability of the peasant to stand the initial shock—to hold out till the official machinery of organisation can work up to his relief and support. The Famine Commissioners recognised this pretty evident fact. Among the grounds of hope for the future mitigation of famines, they expressly mentioned "that greater preparedness of the people to meet them which grows from the increase of thrift and resourcefulness, and the accumulation of capital due to a settled and civilised Government." But the Government is lacking in the last-mentioned quality; it still lags in the military stage; it is an age behind the times. It is true that the poorest of the people are not directly taxed, except for salt, in order to support the military extravagance of the Government; but, as we have over and over again pointed out, the strain reaches them indirectly. The Famine Commissioners expected "the cultivators and landlords to do something towards the improvement of their land, but mainly in their own traditional way, which mostly takes the form of

sinking wells, planting mango and other fruit trees, making tanks and reclaiming waste land." The expectation is wholly reasonable. Yet it is all but hopeless. The rayat is totally unprovided with the necessary means, and the landlord is in too many cases unable to assist him. There is no lack of knowledge or of good intention; the difficulty is the absence of the "wherewithal." What, then, can the Government do? That, too, we have reiterated to weariness. We have pointed out the vicious working of the revenue system, with its inappropriate and cast-iron formality and its unreasonable and inexorable demands. We have grieved over the persistent determination exerted by the Government to keep the agricultural community irrevocably in the legal grasp of the village usurer in which it has miserably thrown him. Nor does any sensible relief come to agriculture through the development of industries. Nay, the very industries of the country are unhesitatingly cramped, handicapped and disorganised whenever Lancashire cotton chooses to exclaim at the competition of the Bombay mills. The way out of the quagmire is plain. Reduce expenditure, and especially military expenditure, with trenchant firmness; accommodate the revenue and taxation to the circumstances and ways of the people; make agricultural banks take the place of the *saukar* and all his works; and foster external commerce as well as internal industries. Otherwise the Government must continue to flounder in the Slough of Despond, which means that the permanence of the Empire, as well as its prestige, remains exposed to gratuitous danger. We can, indeed, but deliver our own soul; we cannot even hope that a Government that now embarks on wild railway expansion on the one hand, and reckless Indian and English loans on the other, piling up the crushing load of Indian indebtedness on a basis of chimerical hopes continuously belied by the perversity of events, will turn its ear to the counsels of prudence, even in the interests of national prosperity, to say nothing of national preservation.

The question of provincial contracts must now be regarded as having entered on a serious practical stage. It has become a point of urgent administrative importance. In the Legislative Council, Mr. Sayani passed a series of criticisms that deserve the closest attention, and that none the less because he gave them judiciously restrained and tentative expression. The system, he said,

"cannot conduce to economy in financial administration, nor favour the progress of internal development or administrative improvement."

If this be true, then it is the condemnation of the system. Now, what were the points of inefficiency

that Mr. Sayani had in his mind when he uttered this condemnation? They were—

"Unequal and unfair apportionments between Imperial and local needs on the one hand, and as between one province and another on the other—a standing source of irritation and discontent in itself—short-term settlements not calculated to inspire a sense of security or certainty, periodical re-adjustments of assignments generally resulting in curtailment of provincial resources and impairing the continuity of provincial work, extraordinary provincial contributions levied apparently without convincing reason or clearly demonstrated necessity: these are some of the features of the system, and there is no wonder that they reduce its value, and in its practical working do not show it to much advantage."

The system, instead of being a source of strength, local, and therefore imperial, operates, in fact, as a deplorable cause of weakness and waste. Responsibilities are placed upon the provinces, and the provinces never know the day when their projects may be thwarted or paralyzed. When they have got the money in hand, they are sorely tempted to hurry its expenditure on their own undertakings before the mandate to deliver it up comes down upon them from Calcutta. There can be but little wonder if there be heartburnings in Bombay and Madras when the local provision for local needs is suddenly appropriated to be poured through the military sieve on the barren mountains beyond the North-West Frontier. If there is any country in the world where it is vital at the present moment to promote internal improvements, that country is India. And yet there the central Government takes to itself about two-thirds of the revenues—a far larger proportion than in any other country—and effectually hampers the ordinary local administration. Besides, the meagre and grossly inadequate provincial assignments are, as Mr. Sayani properly points out, "liable to curtailment on periodical revision, which introduces an element of uncertainty calculated to paralyze all solid advance, and was not contemplated in the original scheme." Why, then, should the provincial authorities worry their life out in penuriously economical management? How is it possible that their proper work—the work for which they are responsible—should proceed with the continuity necessary for prosperous development? The central Government must, of course, go on; and its difficulties constitute the measure of provincial embarrassment and neutrality. Mr. Sayani proposes a dilemma:

"Now, the embarrassments of the central exchequer can only be either permanent or temporary in their nature. If permanent, let there be a permanent readjustment; if temporary, let there be a temporary contribution; but surely there is no justification for revision, or, in other words, asking more and more, at regular intervals—it takes away all elements of permanence and fixity."

In any case, the short-term settlements are deprecated even by some of the most experienced and

distinguished official members, past as well as present, of the Viceroy's Council. A survey of the working of the system during the past quarter of a century cannot leave any doubts in any reasonable and independent mind that it is a grievous hindrance to the natural progress of provincial development, and therefore an imperial mistake. And so, once more, we are brought back to the perennial source of the whole mischief—the extravagant expenditure of the central authorities on their unprofitable military policy. It is more than time for the House of Commons to address itself seriously to the consideration of these fundamental questions of Indian government and imperial prosperity and safety.

THE public at home was startled on June 11th by a Simla telegram announcing "Disaster to an Indian frontier force; British officers killed and wounded." The "contents-bills" of some of the evening newspapers in London and the country improved the occasion with such wanton and pernicious nonsense as "Rising in India," "British Disaster in India," and "Treacherous attack by Natives." One subsequently learned that a force escorting a political officer who was deputed to fix a site for a military post in the Tochi valley on the road to Ghazni had been attacked by local tribesmen, decimated, and pursued for four miles until it was relieved from Datta Khel, the post whence it had started. "No reason can be assigned for this sudden outbreak except the return of a fanatical priest." So one read in the *Times* of June 12th. But the reason seems obvious when one considers that the force was invading far beyond the frontier, tribal territory which it had no right to enter and whence we had repeatedly been warned off by the attitude of the inhabitants. Our dealings with Afghans for sixty years (at the expense of the Indian taxpayers) have long since made us acquainted with their determination to keep the territory free from the domination of any *Kafir* or infidel Power, and with their readiness to lay down their lives in fighting for their ancient independence and their faith. It seems incredible, therefore, that those who planned the invasion should have deluded themselves into the belief that the tribesmen would forbear opposing our attempt to fortify ourselves in their territory. It is possible, of course, that the incursion was intended to provoke war. If so, it has served its purpose, for orders have been issued for a larger force, under Major General Corrie Bird, to invade the Tochi valley forthwith, and probably also to establish further posts on the road to Ghazni, the goal of the enterprise. Meanwhile, as war appears certain, it may be of interest to review the events which have led to the present situation.

THE Darwesh Khel Waziris who are The Waziristan "Deal." said to have attacked the British force in the Tochi valley belong to a numerous clan, a section of which, the Kabul Khel Waziris, occupy a territory to the North of the valley, and another section, the Mahsud Waziris, dwell in the Zhob country some miles to the South. In 1880 we unsuccessfully attempted to subjugate the former, and in 1888 we strove to bring the latter under our control, intending to construct a railway through their territory in order to connect our frontier station of Dehra Ismail Khan through the Gumal Pass with Pishin. The column sent in 1888 to survey that pass was, however, hindered from accomplishing its mission by tribesmen from Makin. And when, in the following year, a considerable force advanced from Baluchistan for the same purpose, it was arrested by the Kiddarwai tribe. In 1890, however, the late Sir R. Sandeman entered into negotiations with chiefs in the Zhob country and was allowed, in consideration of annual subsidies guaranteed to them, to establish a post at Apozai which was subsequently named Fort Sandeman. He induced at the same time the Mahsud Waziris and other local tribes to keep the Gumal Pass open for trade with India on condition of their being annually paid certain subsidies by the Government. But when the tribes perceived that we were fortifying ourselves at Apozai, and using the Gumal Pass for bringing additional military forces into the Zhob valley, they repudiated the bargain accepted by the local chiefs without their concurrence, and started a series of attacks on our post by night-firing into our camp, cutting off our soldiers when they strayed from their lines, plundering our convoys and harassing our communications with India. When we complained of these annoyances to the Amir and represented them in the light of hostilities committed on British soil, he enquired in his reply as to the exact boundary of our Indian Empire, obviously implying that our grievances were the result of our own encroachment upon independent tribal territory. At the same time he complied with our request that an officer of his who was stationed in Waziristan should be recalled. The Waziris nevertheless continued their attacks, a circumstance which we attributed to influence exercised by the Amir himself, and it was thereupon sought to intimidate him by a threat (published in the *Times* of November 20, 1892) to the effect that we should annihilate his kingdom unless he fell in with our settled frontier policy. The step, however, having produced no tangible result, we ultimately arranged for a conference in his capital at which we contended that the Eastern border tribes of Afghanistan were not his subjects as they paid him no revenue and were ruled by their own elected *maliks*. And we agreed to increase the

subsidy of 1,200,000 rupees which he was receiving from India to 1,800,000 rupees, provided that he undertook to abstain from giving material assistance to any border tribe who resisted the introduction of British rule in their territory. These terms were accepted by him. And as we also contended that his kingdom did not extend to India, but lay beyond the border lands, he consented to a joint Commission being appointed by him and ourselves for demarcating the boundary line which, according to our view, separates his kingdom from the territories of the independent border tribes.

THE theory propounded by us is, however, inconsistent and irreconcilable with the laws and customs prevailing in Afghanistan, where the tribes of the country are all united by a general compact binding each to keep the land of Islam free from the *kafir*, or infidel, and to join in a *jihad*, or religious war undertaken for the expulsion of the *kafirs*. Much of this was revealed to us in papers which we succeeded in intercepting, including a letter addressed to tribal leaders by the Amír himself, in which it was said:—

"God has imposed *jihad* on all believers, and whoever shall deny this shall be a *kafir*. You should fight the *kafirs* who come into your land. Fear not death. All believers should join in *jihad*; they should not, like women, sit in their houses, but, like men, become *ghazis* (martyrs) in the cause. True Muslims should hasten to the frontier which it is their duty to guard and protect, preventing *kafirs* from entering the land of Islam. We call on all inhabitants of cities and villages to support the religion of Islam by prayer, by fasts, and by war. The frontiers of the territory of Islam have fallen into the power of oppressors. All believers are bound to join in *jihad* when they are called to arms. By the grace of God they should do their utmost to uphold the religion of Mahomed. Let them go forth to war, and like tigers meet the host of unbelievers. Let them mow down with their swords that pernicious body, and use their heads like bulls."

With a knowledge of these facts it seems childish, if not insincere, to contend that the tribesmen of the Tochi valley had no reason to oppose the force which invaded their territory last month. And as the road which we are endeavouring to open through that valley leads to the heart of the Amír's kingdom, we may possibly find ourselves before long engaged in a third Afghan war unless peaceable means be again found for escaping from difficulties brought on by our own action.

Work in the Constituencies. ELSEWHERE in this issue will be found some account of the series of meetings which, under arrangements made by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, have recently been addressed by the Indian gentlemen selected to give evidence before Lord Welby's Commission. The importance of the work which has thus been done by Mr. Dadabhai

Naoroji, Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. D. H. Wacha, Professor G. K. Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer cannot be over-estimated. Speakers and writers on Indian questions are sometimes a little apt to assume that British opinion at home coincides with the less generous views of Anglo-Indian bureaucrats. Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth. An average audience of British electors is never appealed to in vain on the broad grounds of justice, equal dealing, and fidelity to pledges, and to carry the case of India to the tribunal of the British constituencies is to be secure, at any rate, of a sympathetic hearing. It happened, by an unfortunate coincidence, that the Indian speakers in the recent campaign set out under exceptionally discouraging circumstances. The time of the year was unfavourable, and there was much other excitement to distract public attention. But the conspicuous success which they everywhere achieved under these trying conditions affords the best guarantee for the future. For of course it need hardly be said that it will be the duty of all concerned to follow up in a vigorous campaign the advantages which have been gained. To supply information to members of Parliament is not enough. Efforts of that kind, as the British Committee has always recognised, need to be supplemented by direct appeals to the constituencies themselves, and in this work the co-operation of Indian speakers, whose knowledge is at first hand, and whose success in addressing audiences is proverbial, cannot be valued too highly. If the time at the disposal of Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. Wacha, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer had been longer, more meetings could have been arranged for them. As it was we believe that they found their time and energy fully engaged. The thanks of their fellow-countrymen throughout India are due to them for their public-spirited labours at a time when most visitors to England have found occupation for their leisure in very different directions.

As an example of the results achieved by this campaign in the constituencies it may be interesting to quote the

remarks of the *Sunderland Daily Echo* upon the meeting addressed at Sunderland on May 19th by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee:

"The meeting at the Liberal Club last night to hear the Indian representatives was very successful. The speeches of the visitors were clear and forcible, and in one case eloquent. They pleaded for Home Rule for India. It will be a long time before public opinion in this country is brought to that point, but there could be no better means of hastening the day than such visits and such speeches. No one could imagine for a moment that the Indian visitors last night were inferior in grasp of political subjects to Englishmen of the best class. With leaders of so high a type the Indian people must eventually be a self-governing race."

Similarly the meeting at Hastings on May 26th passed a resolution rejoicing "in the existence of the Indian National Congress" and believing "in the wisdom of conferring larger representative powers upon the people of our greatest dependency." It should be added that the Indian delegates were on more than one occasion supported by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. J. P. Goodridge, Mr. H. N. Haridas and others. Mr. Haridas, indeed, in his work in mid-Derbyshire during the past three years has set an example which other Indians might with advantage follow. Lord Rosebery said some time ago that the best way to fight a constituency was to get to know every man, woman and child in it. That is what Mr. Haridas appears to have done in Belper. He has won his way not only to the heads but also to the hearts of the people, and nobody who reads the account of the interesting farewell meeting at which his numerous friends presented him with a token of their esteem can doubt the sincerity of the feelings he has inspired. One result of Mr. Haridas's work is that the member for the division, Mr. J. A. Jacoby, has pledged himself, both in his election address and in speeches, to support all reasonable reforms for India. Mr. John Smedley, of Belper, to whose good offices Mr. Haridas's opportunities have been largely due, writes to us as follows:—

"I must bear my testimony to the very great interest, and devotion, which Mr. Haridas has unceasingly brought to bear on this question of Indian reform during his sojourn in this country. He is richly deserving of the best thanks of all true Indian reformers. The Congress Committee in London are doing a good and useful work, but I think it might be extended to the provinces with good results, and gentlemen in various parts of the country, who are known to be interested, invited to join the committee and to attend special meetings, say once a quarter. It might be well also to hold a conference in one of the provincial towns once a year, changing the place every year, to which interested ladies and gentlemen might be invited. By this means the democracy of England would become informed. And as it is the intention of our Indian friends to come over in strong force, with a contingent of their best platform men, to hold an Indian National Congress in London as soon as possible, this would prepare the way, and when they come over we should have an organisation at work which would make it easy to arrange for public meetings all over the country. Since so much has been done in Mid-Derbyshire by Mr. Haridas, many other constituencies could be captured, and by this means substantial progress made. For it is in this country that the battle has to be fought, and the sooner this fact is realised both in India and in England the better."

How India
is "Bled."

THE Indian Trade and Navigation Returns for the month of March, which give the totals of the sea-borne Trade of India for the year ending 31st of that month, have tardily come to hand. The extent of the area from which the items have to be collected unavoidably causes delay in the adjustment in the final month of the year's record. The aggregate commercial transactions of India with all other seafaring nations for the year 1896-7 are here given, together with those of the two years preceding for comparison. We present them in Rx.:—

	1896-7	1895-6	1894-5
Exports:	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Merchandise ..	103,983,618	114,334,738	108,913,778
Treasure ..	4,937,495	4,259,810	8,226,071
	<u>108,921,113</u>	<u>118,594,548</u>	<u>117,139,849</u>

	1896-7	1895-6	1894-5
Imports:	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Merchandise ..	76,215,835	72,936,752	73,628,992
Treasure ..	13,084,563	13,367,987	9,581,207
	<u>89,300,398</u>	<u>86,304,739</u>	<u>83,110,199</u>
INDIA'S COMMERCIAL DEFICIT ..	Rx. 19,620,715	32,289,809	34,029,650

It will be seen that while the aggregate trade of the year only fell below that of 1895-6 by rather more than 6 per cent. (667 lakhs) there were great differences in the proportion of exports and imports: the former fell off by 967 lakhs, while imports exceeded those of 1895-6 by nearly 300 lakhs. If it be asked where the effects of the famine came in, that can be answered by referring to the figures as they stood at the end of September last, at the end of the half-year. At that period the imports were much in excess of the previous year, cotton goods having been largely taken while the exports had fallen only by a small percentage, chiefly in wheat. But, as everybody knows, with October came failure of crops over a large part of India, and poverty checked demand for imported goods. But it may be remarked that the net import of bullion was little less than in the preceding year, and very much larger than in 1894-5. And in a certain demi-official notice this apparent anomaly is thus spoken of: "it is remarkable that India should be able to take off over eight crores' worth of the precious metals during a period when trade was depressed and millions of people have been suffering from scarcity of food and famine." It was also remarked that, the mints being closed, gold and silver could only be regarded as commodities in British India, while very little was being coined in the Native States. Certainly, we have here one of those things of India which are not quite plain even to the usually well-informed official mind. Let us assist it if we can. First, let it be noted that eighty millions of rupees amongst the nearly 300 millions of India gives little more than four annas, say sixpence a head. And of this it is tolerably certain a somewhat larger share would be taken by the sixty-six millions in the Native States. This simple arithmetical test of India's absorption of the precious metals is habitually overlooked. Then it is obvious that, as merchants and native distributors of cotton goods and other imports of European produce would see at once in October that demand would largely fall off, they would import bullion instead. For, though the mints would not coin for them, gold and silver bars would suffice to adjust their current balances and maintain their reserves. And when it is noticed that Indian imports of bullion in 1894-5 were very small, less than one million Rx., there seems nothing very "remarkable" in the eight crores importation of last year. What is really "remarkable" as compared with other nations of the earth, and an anomaly that runs through all statements of the results of India's foreign trade, is, as shown above, that in the three years her commercial outgoings have exceeded her incomings by the enormous sum of Rx. 85,941,174. The marvel is, not that India is impoverished, but that the masses of her people can live at all.

LORD ROBERTS'S SECOND THOUGHTS.

By J. DA Costa.

Lord Roberts's book has now been read by thousands of persons, and has doubtless imparted to many of them more accurate notions of the people and circumstances of India than they previously entertained. His lordship's graphic description of stirring events in the mutinies and rebellion of 1857-59—the ruthless massacre of Englishmen and Englishwomen, the sudden destruction of British rule in Upper India and its ultimate restoration through the heroic action of British officers and the fidelity of Natives—cannot be perused without thrilling interest being awakened in the reader.

Other events of equal interest occurred during the period to which the book relates—the Afghan war of 1878-80 and the minor wars undertaken for the subjugation of our tribal neighbours on the North and North-West of India. These wars were entered upon in pursuance of a frontier policy which certain influential statesmen at home adopted in 1876 on the plea that a military occupation of Afghanistan was necessary for securing our Indian possessions against an invasion from Russia. The Prime Minister created, however, considerable surprise, when inaugurating that policy in November, 1878, by denying the imminence of a Russian invasion and declaring that the policy simply aimed at acquiring a scientific frontier which could be defended at a considerably smaller cost than the frontier we actually possessed.

"So far as the invasion of India in that quarter is concerned," added Lord Beaconsfield, "it is the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that it is hardly practicable. The base of operations of any possible foe is so remote, the communications so difficult, the aspect of the country so forbidding, that we have long arrived at the opinion that an invasion of our Empire by passing the mountains which form our North-West frontier is one which we need not dread."

The inauguration of a war policy on the inconsistent plea of reducing military expenditure created mistrust and doubts as to the real aim of the Cabinet, and when the war undertaken for its execution came to a disastrous end, popular indignation at home brought about the immediate downfall of the Ministry.

Lord Roberts, having taken a prominent part in the war, had full opportunities of forming a correct judgment on the policy best calculated to secure the N.-W. frontier of India, and he recorded his opinion on the subject in a despatch, dated from Kabul, the 29th May, 1880, in which, referring to the apprehended advance of a Russian Army through Afghanistan he said:—

"The longer and more difficult the line of communication is, the more numerous and greater the obstacles which Russia should have to overcome; and so far from shortening one mile of the road, I would let the web of difficulties extend to the very mouth of the Khyber Pass. Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attacking the Afghans to our interests, if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime."

This opinion substantially coincides with the opinion expressed by the high authorities who were

consulted in the matter in 1866-67. Lord Lawrence and his Council said in their collective reply to the Secretary of State:—

"We think it impolitic and unwise to decrease any of the difficulties which would be entailed on Russia, if that country thought of invading India, as we should certainly decrease them if we left our frontier and met her half way, in a difficult country and possibly in the midst of a hostile and exasperated population. We see no limit to the expenditure which such a move might require. Should Russia ever think of invading India, our strongest security would be found in our previous abstinence from all entanglements at Kabul or Kandahar, or any similar outpost, in full reliance on a compact army within our territories or on our border."

The Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's Forces in India, in a minute which accompanied the despatch, observed:—

"As a military and vast political power, we have literally nothing to fear from Russia, whether she stop at her present limits or spread her power, even to our own borders. A great mischief is done by those, from whatever cause, occupy themselves in preaching the falsehood of our weakness in India. We are simply invincible in that country against all the powers in the world, provided we are true to ourselves."

These views were formed on the experience of our first Afghan war, and when they were confirmed by Lord Roberts's despatch based on the experience of our second Afghan war, the "scientific frontier" policy stood universally condemned, and was abandoned by the Government. In 1885, however, when the originators of that policy were returned to power on the Irish Home Rule question, they endeavoured to vindicate their unsuccessful war administration through fresh attempts to execute their unfortunate frontier policy. The Indian army was at once materially increased on the revived plea of danger from Russian ambition, and expeditions were organised to subjugate the border-tribes of Afghanistan and construct military roads through their territories, so that communications with India might be facilitated when a British army again entered the Afghan kingdom. These trans-frontier expeditions, however, were not more successful than the war of 1878-80 had been. The tribes were not subjugated, nor were the military roads made; and the renewed attempts to execute the "scientific frontier" policy have thus far resulted only in continued bloodshed, in the complete alienation of our neighbours and in a heavy addition to the public debt of India.

Reverting now to Lord Roberts's book, the following passage, which indicates an entire change of opinion in his lordship's mind since May, 1880, and expresses an admiring acquiescence in the wisdom of a policy which stands uncompromisingly condemned by the opinion which he then recorded under official responsibility, is doubtless read with considerable surprise. Referring to the massacre of the British Envoy and his escort in September, 1879, the author says:—

"I found Lord Lytton in a state of deep distress and depression. He strongly felt the collapse of the Mission and the heavy blow at the policy of rectifying our defective frontier and rendering India secure against foreign aggression—a policy which, at the present moment, is becoming what Lord Lytton, with his foresight and intelligent appreciation of our responsibilities and India's requirements, would then have made it."

The policy, in respect of which this flattering encomium is bestowed on Lord Lytton's foresight and intelligent appreciation of what is vaguely alluded to as "our responsibilities and India's requirements," was Lord Beaconsfield's scientific frontier policy in the execution of which the Viceroy was but an obedient instrument in the hands of the Premier—a fact which is clearly implied by Lord Roberts himself at page 171, where he says:—

"My ideas about negotiations being premature were freely expressed to Colonel Colley, Lord Lytton's private secretary; but he explained to me that, right or wrong, the Viceroy had no option in the matter: that there was the strongest feeling in England against the continuance of the war."

Then as regards Lord Lytton's foresight, it appears to have been blind to the fatal doom to which he was sending the mission, while Lord Roberts seems to have exercised keener foresight on the occasion, since he had the strongest presentiments of Sir Louis Cavignari's fate, and tells us how exceedingly sad he felt when he accompanied that officer towards Kabul and took leave of him on the road.

These inconsistencies might appear insignificant; but they detract from the accuracy of the picture purporting to represent the actors in important events of the period; and as Lord Roberts's book may influence the future historian, the value of the lesson, which it is the province of history to teach, might be impaired, were even such inaccuracies in contemporaneous chronicles to remain unchallenged.

Another passage in the book obscures a very significant question, namely, whether the negotiations which resulted in the ominous treaty of Gandamak were initiated by us or by Yakub Khan. Lord Roberts tells us at page 168 that Yakub Khan, in communicating the death of his father, wrote that "he was anxious matters might be so arranged that the friendship of his State with the British Government may remain constant and firm." This might lead the reader to conclude that Yakub was the originator of those negotiations, while, as a matter of fact, they were opened by us. The translated extract which Lord Roberts mentions was taken from Yakub's answer to a letter which the British Agent had addressed to him. That letter has been kept secret, and was omitted in the papers presented to Parliament. Sir Louis Cavignari's telegram of 22nd February, however, clears up the obscured question by stating: "The letter affords favourable opportunity of opening negotiations with Yakub Khan."

By the treaty of Gandamak, the conclusion of which was brought about by the negotiations then opened by us, we bound ourselves to pay an annual subsidy to the Amir, although he rejected the conditions contended for by us, excepting our unwise and unfortunate claim to have a British Envoy accredited at his court. Of our other claims Lord Roberts says at page 169:—

"Yakub Khan declined to renounce his authority over the Khyber and Michni Passes and the tribes in their vicinity, and refused to consent to Kuram, Pishin and Sibi being placed under British protection and control."

The urgent necessity to terminate the war had been revealed to Lord Roberts in his conversation

with Lord Lytton's private secretary; and that necessity soon became absolutely imperative, owing to the critical situations into which our armies had drifted.

The situation of the Khyber army is thus described in an Indian Government despatch to the Secretary of State:—

"The suspended activity of our troops on the Khyber line had begun to exercise a very prejudicial influence over our political as well as military position in Afghanistan, with the result of a recrudescence of petty but vexatious and harassing attacks from the surrounding tribes. At the same time the increasing heat of the weather and the defective sanitary condition of Jellalabad, had begun to tell injuriously on the health of the large force concentrated in that locality; and due regard to the well-being of our troops necessitated an immediate change of quarters." (C. 2461, 1879).

Regarding the Kuram Field Force commanded by General Roberts, Major Colquhoun's diary states:—

"January 7th. A string of camels which has been seized and were being led away, were still visible in the plain; but it would not have been possible, with the mass still hanging about, to attempt the recapture without the risk of being cut off. 14th. Disturbed all night by rumours that the Mangals intended attacking. Trenches were thrown up. 16th. No forage for camels; 400 sent back to Hazir Pir. 17th. The cold and indifferent supply of water affected the health of the troops; intermittent fever, pneumonia and dysentery began to show themselves. 29th. The fort of Matun (which we had to evacuate) was emptied of all powder and grain; but as there were not many camels available, the powder was poured into the wet ditch, and the grain which could not be carried off was set alight. The task being over, there remained two alternatives, either to fight the Mangals or to retire. The latter course was decided on; the enemy were in great force, and even if they had been driven back to the hills, nothing would have been gained, as they could not have been pursued. The Mangals, emboldened by our seeming inactivity, ventured out and formed a line a mile long towards the West. A little before 12 the retirement began while the enemy were still at a distance. February 2nd. A convoy of sick and wounded was ordered to march *via* the Darwaza Pass, as there was some chance that the Mangals might otherwise attack the party. On the night of the 2nd March, a raid was made by the Alisherai and Mamuzais. After killing five of our men and wounding seven, the raiders carried off 20 mules. May 30th. Alikheyl. The increasing heat is affecting the troops, and, in consequence of several cases of erysipelas, it was decided to move to Plateau A. The 67th regiment suffered more from a severe form of typhoid. June 3rd. The General and Staff rode up to the top of a spur with the idea of proceeding to the Hassan Kheyls valley; but the headman pointed out that part of this road lay through the Mangal territory, where opposition was likely to be met with. The idea was consequently abandoned. The party was taken up a spur which overlooked the pass. When the Mangals in the valley sighted the party on the ridge, their drums beat and they began to collect with the object of fighting, so the party returned to camp."

Lastly, as regards the Quetta army, the following entries in Major Le Messurier's published diary show the deplorable state in which that column found itself soon after the opening of the campaign:—

"January 7th. A biting cold wind all day: 260 camels are reported to have died. The water all along is brackish. Provisions are not easily obtained, and a foraging party was ordered towards Mirzan, viz., 2 guns 11.11 R.A., 100 sabres 15th Hussars, a squadron of the 19th Bengal Lancers, and a detachment of Sappers. The mail is unsafe; our men are stopped, stripped and flogged, and sometimes killed. 29th. Thermometer, 25 deg.; increased mortality among the camels. No more tobacco. February 2nd. We have turned back our steps towards Kandahar. One and all in the dumps. Whatever influence our political officer may have over the tribesmen must wane when they see our force quietly returning after

accomplishing so little. 4th. Commissariat out of wood. Camels dying off. 7th. Black frost last night; increased mortality among camels. 12th. A division of the forces, some going back to India. The bread we have been having and the water combined account for the sickness. April 6th. The stench from the dead camels along the line was scarcely bearable. 24th. Rode back to Kandahar, and heard of Colonel Fellowe's death; he was as fine a looking man as any of the force, and most active. June 23rd. One of the 60th sentries shot at last night. The colonel is laid up; Rogers, Hawkins and Oliver are all down with fever. July 14th. Cholera has appeared, ending fatally in fourteen cases. 17th. Cholera still busy at head-quarters and the two squadrons."

These papers conclusively account for the stringent necessity we found ourselves in to negotiate for peace on the best terms obtainable. The situation has been described with remarkable clearness by an officer serving with the forces, in a paper which was published in 1880, saying:—

"The war was commenced in ignorance of the difficulties to be encountered, and in consequence, at an early period, the Government found itself, with exhausted resources, compelled to make a peace which might almost have been dictated by its adversary. The enormous difficulty of carrying out a successful campaign in Afghanistan is due to two causes. The first cause is the absence of combined resistance. Attacking the Afghan tribes is like making sword thrusts into the water. You meet with no resistance, but you also do no injury. The tribes harass the communications of an invading army; they cut off straggling parties; they plunder baggage; they give the troops no rest; but they carefully avoid a decisive action. The invading force moves wherever it pleases; but it never holds more of the country than the ground on which it is actually encamped. Each separate tribe is, as it were, an independent centre of life which requires a separate and special operation for its extinction. The consequence is that the only way in which we could hope to enforce our authority would be by a simultaneous occupation of the entire country; and seeing that the country is as large as France, very sparsely populated, and quite incapable of feeding a large army, such an occupation is simply impossible. The other great difficulty is that there is scarcely any forage in Afghanistan, and consequently the transport train of an invading army cannot fail to be crippled after a few weeks of active service. The moment that such a catastrophe is consummated, an army in the field becomes as cumbersome and useless as a swan on a turnpike road. This latter difficulty it was which compelled the Government to make the treaty of Gandamak."

Lord Roberts's deservedly famed march to the Relief of Kandahar is narrated in Chapters LX and LXI with many details as to the composition of his army, the difficulty of securing transport and supplies, the sufferings endured from the barren and hilly nature of the land, the scarcity of water and the excessive variations of temperature from night to day. The main difficulty, however, which was apprehended, when the project was entertained, was the risk of being delayed on the road by armed tribal gatherings and the necessity of foraging for provisions—a risk which involved the chance of the relieving force not reaching Kandahar until that place had fallen before Ayub Khan's victorious army. From page 345 of Lord Roberts's book, it would appear that "the difficulties of daily procuring food for the 18,000 men and 11,000 animals were always overcome with the able assistance of Major Hastings and his political staff, and that the force arrived at Kandahar without opposition."

These statements are so irreconcilable with our previous experience, when supplies had to be obtained through the employment of strong foraging parties, and the tribes constantly manifested their

hostility by raids or armed gatherings, that an explanation seems wanting to account for this marvellous change in the attitude of the Afghans. The book affords none, unless one be implied in the reference at page 338 to "the delicate and difficult negotiations which Mr. Griffin is said to have carried on with great skill and patience" shortly after the Maiwand disaster became known at Kabul.

Mr. Archibald Forbes, accordingly, in his history of the two Afghan wars, states at page 290 that:—

"On the 3rd August, when Mr. Griffin informed Abdur Rahman of the necessity of a British force marching from Kabul to Kandahar, so willing was the Amir to be of service in the matter that he sent influential persons of his party in advance to arrange with the local headmen to have supplies collected for the column."

Mr. Forbes tells us in the next page that "under the arrangement then concluded, the Amir was to receive 19½ lakhs of rupees—£195,000—ten lakhs of which were given as an earnest of British friendship and the balance was money belonging to the Afghan State," i.e., the value of treasure seized by us during our occupation of Kabul.

The further conditions which we accepted on that occasion were to forego the fine we had imposed on the inhabitants of Kabul for their connivance at the massacre of the British Envoy and his escort, to deliver up the guns which were not required for the Kandahar expedition, and to hand over intact to the Amir the forts we had built around Kabul, and which we intended to destroy before evacuating the country.

It appears also from Mr. Stephen Wheeler's book on Abdur Rahman, published in 1895, at page 86, that—

"General Roberts started for Kandahar a week after Mr. Griffin's interview with the Amir, and that the remainder of the British troops, under Sir Donald Stewart, evacuated Sherpur and set out for India on August the 10th: also that the Amir did what he could to facilitate the march of the force, that General Roberts was preceded by officers of the Amir charged with collecting supplies and clearing the road of obstruction, and that the tribesmen were told that the Amir was sending a division of the infidel army out of the country by way of Kandahar." Mr. Wheeler adds: "This was not complimentary to us, but the Amir's message proved effectual."

Another part of Lord Roberts's book needs elucidation lest it should be interpreted as confirming an erroneous statement which has been sedulously circulated, to the effect that Abdur Rahman received his Amirship at our hands. Sir Lepel Griffin, through whom our communications with Abdur Rahman were carried on throughout, distinctly states in his article in the *Fortnightly* of December, 1893, that Abdur Rahman claimed sovereignty over the entire Kingdom which had been ruled by his grandsire, adding that "he had been chosen by the people of Afghanistan to protect the country in the name of Islam against all infidel encroachments." Indeed Mr. Howard Hensman's book had already informed the public of the utter failure of our endeavours to lead Abdur Rahman to some step which might give colour to the insinuation that he had received his Amirship from us. Mr. Hensman writes in his diary on the 4th June, 1880:

"Abdur Rahman is serenely independent in his attitude, and has given no promise whatever on any specific points con-

needed with the Amirship. He seems fully aware of our awkward position in the country. He is working to make the British, and not himself, the grateful party in the negotiations. There is a cool self-possessed tone of inquiry in his letter, as if he felt himself master of the situation, and meant to dictate his own terms. We are appearing in the eyes of the people rather as supplicants than as dictators to Abdar Rahman. July 2nd. We have so far lowered our pride as to treat with Abdar Rahman in order to secure peace. 22nd. We have formally acknowledged him as Amir. August 2nd. A strong division has been told off to march southward under Sir F. Roberts. The flower of the force being thus taken away, it becomes imperative that the army left in Sherpur should retire towards India without delay. 9th. Sir D. Stewart (with 20,000 men including camp-followers) left for India. His march will, it is expected, be a very peaceful one, as the chief Ghilzai leaders are with the Amir who has been quietly warned to keep them with him, and out of mischief, until our troops got to the east of Gandamak. How we have hated our sojourn in Afghanistan of late, only the record of our curses, as it be kept, can ever reveal."

Now, Lord Roberts tells us at page 372, vol. ii:—

"I now heard that Abdar Rahman had been finally nominated Amir of Kabul on the 10th August, and that immediately after the ceremony of installation, Sir Donald Stewart had marched the whole British force out of Kabul on their return to India."

It seems impossible to doubt that the information on which the above lines were written, was essentially imperfect or intentionally misleading, seeing that the troops under Sir D. Stewart were not in Kabul on the 10th August, 1880, and that no account or reliable evidence whatever has, to this day, appeared of the alleged ceremony with which Sir D. Stewart is said to have installed Abdar Rahman, Amir of Kabul, within the walls of that city. Indeed the plight we were in at the time sufficiently reveals the untrustworthiness of the report, and Lord Roberts does not mention on what ground he accepted its truth.

This correction is the more needed that it is argued, from the false report in question, that, having incurred serious responsibilities in appointing the Amir, we have acquired the consequent right to dictate to our nominee—an argument which is being used in favour of our making fresh attempts to execute the unsound "scientific frontier" policy so disastrously pursued in 1878-80.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

By DINSHAW EDULJI WACHA.

It may be truly observed that, as far as the finances of India are concerned, they are of a most discouraging character. There are more lean than fat years. If there be years of financial prosperity, they are few and far between. According to official statistics there has been during the last forty-six years a net deficit of 38 crores of rupees. Of course, these years include years of mutiny. But in taking a broad survey of Indian finance, we cannot omit the years of deficit and only look to years of surplus. The fat and the lean years, the exceptional and the normal, must be put on the same level. For it should be remembered that if there have been exceptional years of war or famine, or both, or of low receipts or high expenditure, the

Government has not been slow to demand additional taxes to defray deficits. But the official optimists who have such a horror of brooding over the dark side of Indian finance would have us believe that the exceptional years should not be thought of—which is only another way of suggesting that we have no right to take into consideration all that is damaging to the public finances of the country. This is, of course, quite an intelligible view from the standpoint of our heaven-born financiers—from Sir Richard Temple to Sir James Westland. Ostrich-like, they would wish us to bury our heads in sand at years of appalling deficit and to raise them up at years of surpluses, many of a doubtful character—for we cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that the finances of India are sometimes "cooked." There is no exaggeration in the statement. It was most effectively brought out in the evidence before the East India Committee of Finance in 1871-4, under the searching cross-fire of examination by the late lamented Professor Fawcett. How the accounts were cooked, how items of capital were credited to revenue and so forth, could be still read with profit and instruction in those admirable essays on Indian finance which that accurate and accomplished expert wrote. Every student of Indian finance should read, mark, and inwardly digest them.

It may, therefore, be safely asserted that the ordinary condition of Indian finance for the last half-century is one of chronic deficit. But even if we omit from consideration the deficits which arose on account of the expenditure incurred in quelling the mutiny, the result is hardly satisfactory. At the best, expenditure just balances income. There is no *true surplus* to speak of. So able and accomplished an expert in Indian finance as Sir J. Strachey had to say as much. India has no reserve of any kind whatever to fall back upon. The moment there is a large deficit we have to borrow either in rupees or sterling. There is no reserve upon which to draw even for a rupee, while borrowing only adds to the permanent charges which have to be paid out of revenue. The fact is that India, after all, is a poor country. It is no exception to that "Asiatic poverty" on which eminent writers on public finance have discoursed. The system of administration, on the other hand, is Western—that is to say, of a highly organised, and, therefore, most expensive character. To carry on a system of Western administration in an Asiatic country like India, with its Asiatic poverty, is indeed the very reverse of financial statesmanship. It is a system foredoomed to failure, and must, in the long run, end in a huge financial catastrophe. Unless there is a radical change in the system, I, for one, despair of ever witnessing any financial stability in Indian finance, much less financial prosperity. The taxpayers will be ground down more and more, while the harpies of the foreign tax-eaters will continue to drain to the very dregs the resources of the country—the products of the hard-earned labour of the teeming millions who find it so difficult to make both ends meet from year to year, and many of whom get not even one full meal a day.

Famine, unfortunately, has once more overtaken the land; and we see how that dire calamity has

affected our finances. The Budget for 1896-97 which was expected to work out to a surplus of 46 lakhs shows, according to the revised estimates, a net deficit of 1.98 crores; that is, after taking into consideration the windfall of 1.46 crores from "improved" exchange. Land revenue and railway receipts alone diminished to the extent of nearly 4 crores, while the State had to provide an expenditure of nearly 2 crores for famine up to the end of March last. Virtually, then, the closed accounts of 1896-97 show a deterioration of 2.44 crores, thus:

Estimated surplus	0.46 crores (now vanished)
Deficit	1.98 ..
	2.44 ..

It should, however, be remembered that the diminution of 2.39 crores in land revenue is *not* a total loss to the State. If the next monsoon proves a fortunate one, a greater portion of this revenue will undoubtedly be recovered. The revenue is suspended, and the moment the rayats are able to pay it the State will exact its pound of flesh. What it may mean to the taxpayers, I need not say. It would in a large number of cases signify *increased* indebtedness. The rayat who has survived the famine will toil hard at his field. But he will have to borrow from the moneylender to buy his implements of agriculture, and something besides to maintain him and his family till the harvest is reaped and the State Shylock is satisfied. And it would be a miracle if he could again begin to prosper at the end of the next five years. Every famine leaves the cultivator in a worse position than before. His indebtedness increases, and poverty therefore grows on him more and more.

But I need not tarry on this economic aspect of the subject. I have said that the net deficit is nearly 2 crores. Now, I maintain that this deficit might have been nowhere had the Finance Minister not been in such hot hurry last year to dispose of the surplus of 1½ crore he obtained in 1895-96 from better exchange. Sir David Barbour truly observed that there is a mischievous tendency on the part of the Government to take every advantage of transient or apparent prosperity. It hastens to dispose of its surplus without taking thought of the morrow. It discards in the management of the finances the ordinary rules of caution and prudence. It ignores the bitter experience of the past, and it fritters away, like the prodigal, all moderate surpluses on objects of a most questionable, if not worthless character.

Let us see how the 1½ crore of surplus—an accident—derived from better exchange in 1895-96 was disposed of. In the first place, the Government of India gifted away with a light heart half a crore to pious and disinterested Manchester, in "loyal" obedience to the "mandate" of the Secretary of State. In spite of the united protest of all India, Indian and Anglo-Indian, in the teeth of remonstrances of the European Chambers of Commerce and the Bombay Mill Owners' Association, it reduced the import duty on cotton goods from 5 to 3½ per cent under the plea of removing the so-called "protection" enjoyed by Indian mill-owners. Not

only was this half-crore sacrificed. It was a *permanent* sacrifice of revenue: so long as this duty is maintained, it is a sacrifice to the tune of half a crore. Can the State justify this needless sacrifice? Could any far-sighted Government, having the same economic conditions as India has, ever care to sacrifice this revenue in the manner the Indian Government did last year? If nothing else, ordinary prudence would have avoided it. That is one part of want of financial foresight. The other part has reference to the half-crore gifted away with equal disregard to the interests of the taxpayers, who are still burdened with the enhanced duty on salt, and which was promised by Lord Dufferin should go off at the first opportunity to the military department for purposes of mobilisation! This mobilisation, of course, was a logical necessity of the occupation, the unrighteous occupation, of Chitral, which has already entailed on the general revenues of the country a further burden of 25 lakhs per annum. Thus the crore could have been easily saved. Had it been allowed to stand over—or put by—the Finance Minister would have been able to diminish his deficit by that sum. In other words he would have had to borrow less by a crore, now that the deficit has to be made up by borrowing.

But I have yet to bring another fact to the notice of the reader. This is so far as the disposition of the surplus of 1895-96. But it may be reasonably asked, what steps did the Government take to curtail expenditure for partially meeting the deficit of 2 crores in 1896-7? There is not a word in the financial statement about it. Neither has Sir James Westland condescended to enlighten the public in the speech he made on the debate. All that we are able to glean from the preliminary observations in the financial statement is that 38 lakhs were saved in 1896-7. What a curtailment to be sure, when the estimated surplus of half-a-crore has vanished away and a net deficit of nearly 2 crores has had besides to be incurred! It cost them nothing to gift away a crore to two vested interests; but it never occurred to them to see how the deficit could be met without the necessity of borrowing, which, I repeat, adds to the burden of the permanent charges against revenue by way of interest. And yet we are called to admire this piece of finance and clap our hands in praise of our heaven-born financier that he has not exhibited a worse statement.

As to the Budget for the current year, of course, there is a deficit of 2.64 crores, owing to the expenditure on famine, estimated at 3.56 crores. There has been no attempt at curtailment of a *permanent* character. Civil works alone are diminished to the tune of 36 lakhs. Military expenditure virtually stands the same as before. They speciously talk of a "reduction" of 51 lakhs compared with last year; but the reader need not be told that this is pure moonshine. They gave 50 lakhs for mobilisation. This was, according to the authorities, an exceptional expenditure. These 50 lakhs have not recurred this year. This is pointed out as a "saving," and we are absurdly asked to believe that the Government have reduced military expenditure by half-a-crore! This is simply throwing dust in the public eyes. In reality, they have shown no curtailment of a

permanent character in any department. The moment the stress of the present financial condition is removed, there is every probability of an increase rather than a decrease. And if, as I have said before, the suspended land revenue is rigidly collected, the Finance Minister will take credit for having reduced his deficit, when he recounts his financial tale of this year, twelve months hence. Aye, he would even work the miracle of showing a surplus. We have been accustomed to such prodigies in finance in India—of surpluses being converted into deficits, and *vice versa*. Sir John Strachey did that in 1878-79; and what was easy for Sir John to do, would not be difficult for Sir James in 1898-99. But the Budget is so full of fallacies that it is impossible I can refer to them at any length in this place. Again, Sir James loomed large in the official eyes by airing his views on famine charges, protective railways and irrigation works, and provincial assignments. All these are "large" subjects to which it is impossible to do justice in these columns. But the debate on the Budget shows very clearly how necessary it is that the power of moving amendments on the annual financial statement should be conceded without further delay. At present the popular representatives in the Imperial Legislative Council can only speak once, and there is an end of the matter. The Finance Minister has the last word. His speech may be full of fallacies to which the popular representatives might give a rejoinder, but as they are debarred, their mouths are closed. A fallacious impression remains on the mind of the public, specially the British public, and the delusion is created that after all the finances are not so badly managed as they are represented, while non-official criticism is either shallow or ignorant. The suppression of the truth and the suggestion of the false—which is the distinguishing feature of some bureaucrats—cannot be more glaringly perceived in all its nakedness than in the exposition of the annual financial statement. Thus is India financially governed.

LAND REVENUE SETTLEMENT IN MADRAS.

By G. SUBRAMANIA IYER.

The question of the duration of settlements came up for discussion during Lord Wenlock's administration in the Presidency of Madras, and the Madras Government decided to recommend a term of twenty years instead of the thirty which has been the period of settlements till now. The following quotation from the Government Order explains the reasons that led to this recommendation:—

"After careful deliberation, the Government has arrived at the conclusion that the present period is too long and should be curtailed. His Excellency in Council does not lose sight of the primary importance to the rayat of the assurance that the lease of his holding should not, except at the end of lengthened periods, be disturbed by an enhancement of the assessment which he has to pay. A long term undoubtedly gives a sense of security and confidence, while the land market has greater chances of stability; but the great fluctuations that have occurred during the last few years in the currency of the

country, the extension of communications bringing distant products within the influence of universal market prices, and generally, the rapidity with which material and economic changes are proceeding, must bring about a great disturbance in the money value of produce. In these circumstances, it is, in the opinion of Government, on the one hand imprudent to lock up for a period so long as thirty years the State's right to avail itself of the increment that may manifest itself in the value of the produce of the soil; while, on the other hand, it is possible that the pendulum may swing the other way and the prices drop to such an extent that it would be prejudicial to the rayat to deprive him for a protracted term of the opportunity of a revaluation of his assessment. Moreover, in the event of a continuous development in the value of landed property, it is frequently both difficult and inadvisable on a resettlement to demand anything like proportionate increase in the revenue which the rise of prices would justify, and the longer the term of settlement, the more serious the difficulty becomes. This restraint upon the enforcement of the just demand is to some extent obviated by the rule obtaining in this Presidency, which permits the total enhancement, if considerable, to be reached by easy annual additions to the former assessment; but by this expedient the objection is by no means altogether removed."

The reasons, it will be seen, all relate to the interest of the Government. The whole question is looked at from the Government's revenue point of view. Financial considerations of the State prevail over those of the prosperity of the rayats. It is only crocodile tears that Government sheds when it affects to safeguard the rayat's interests by anticipating the possibility of a drop in the prices and a reduction in the valuation of the assessment. The Government has never committed the blunder of reducing the land tax in a single instance of re-settlement. Such a contingency is highly improbable. Who believes that the prices of raw produce in India will drop to the extent suggested by the Government of Madras? We are not sure that the Government itself believes what it suggests as probable. The increasing demand of a growing population, the successive years of drought and scarcity, and the extension of railway communications, would combine to keep the prices at a high level. Considering, moreover, that a large majority of our producers are also consumers, and that in spite of fallen prices, long terms of settlement have their own distinct advantages, the rayats will welcome with joy long term settlements under any circumstances. What decision the Secretary of State has arrived at is not known. But to a question put in the Legislative Council in December last, the Madras Government replied in the following vague terms:

"The policy approved is to respect reasonable expectations based upon past practice, but special circumstances may necessitate an abbreviation of the usual term. The question whether they do so is one to be decided in each case upon its separate merits."

Is it a wonder then that the industry of agriculture in India suffers under all the disadvantages of this glorious uncertainty? Lord Wenlock lamented "the almost absolute divorce from the cultivation of the soil—the principal industry of the country—of men of position and high educational attainments." But the fact is hardly more lamentable than the ignorance of the Governor, surrounded as he was by a number of able and experienced administrators, members of the most glorious civil service in the world. I have no hesitation in stating that this "divorce" is due to the effect on the security and

value of property of the operations of the Land Revenue Settlement Department. No educated person will care to devote his intelligence or money to increasing the produce of the land when he knows that the law does not secure to him the fruits of his industry. None will invest money in the improvement of his land when the revenue officials will, within a few years, certainly take half, or more, of the increased yield due to his enterprise, intelligence, and capital; and there is no law prohibiting them from appropriating the entire yield. In revenue matters the Executive Government is everything. The Civil Courts of Justice are prohibited from enquiring into the justice of any land revenue claim of the Government. Various laws have been passed and every device is resorted to in view to this end.

In 1888, Lord Connemara appointed a Committee to institute a "comprehensive enquiry into the constitution and operations of the Agricultural Department with a view of ascertaining what practical good it has done and is doing, and what good such a department might do under other conditions."

The State is the landlord in India, but unlike other countries where the rents are fixed not by the landlord but for the landlord, in some instances by custom, in others by competition, in India the landlord fixes the rent at any sum he chooses, and in practice in the Madras Presidency he fixes it at the maximum which he thinks can be extracted in good years, after leaving the tenant the barest subsistence allowance, and granting grudgingly—if at all—remissions in bad years, when threats, distress and evictions are alike found useless for the extraction of the full amount. It is obvious that a more effectual plan for keeping the agricultural population in hopeless misery and indebtedness could scarcely be devised. Such a state of things leaves no margin for a capitalist farmer to intervene or to spring into being; but if any one were Quixotic enough to venture on such an enterprise, he would be assuredly prevented by the uncertainty attending even this rack rent, and the certainty that his improvements will at an early date afford ample excuse to the Government for its enhancement.

And what did this Committee say regarding the desirability of finality in settlements?

"That Government be moved to enunciate and make widely known a final policy in the matter of its settlement rules, more especially those relating to the grain valuation of the soil; it is clear from the evidence of highly intelligent and well-informed witnesses" (including, I may mention in passing, the Hon. Justice Subramania Iyer, C.I.E., a Judge of the High Court) "that there exists a widespread feeling of distrust regarding the finality of the grain valuation of soils, and that this feeling largely restrains the investment of capital in the improvement of land. It is stated that so long as any uncertainty regarding the policy of the Government in this matter is permitted to continue, the tenure of land on the rayatwari system is not stable, and that it cannot be stable unless and until the Government declare that in future revisions of assessments the soil valuation and classification first adopted by the Settlement Department shall be final, and will never be disturbed in any future revision."

The Committee further recommended:—

"The second matter is that there appears to be a feeling of mistrust regarding the finality of the grain values assigned to soils by the Settlement Department when revising assessments for the first time. It is feared that future revisions of assessments will be determined on a consideration, not of prices only, but of soils also. A re-valuation of soils at each

recurring revision would, it is said—and we think rightly said—be fatal to improvement. We believe that the present opinion of the Government is opposed to such a re-valuation, and is inclined to make the settlements permanent so far as the grain values of soils are concerned, but there has been no distinct avowal that this will be the policy that will guide future revisions of assessments, while the statement on p. 110, Vol. I. of the Madras Manual of Administration, that at future revisions, soils are liable to re-valuation, and the fact that sanction has been accorded to the re-classification of soils in the Chidambaram and Monargudi Taluks of South Arcot, which were first settled in 1861-62, and are due to be re-settled on the expiration of the thirty years term of their first settlement in 1890-91, give a solid foundation for the want of confidence to which we have alluded. We consider, therefore, that Government should distinctly declare by legislation that, in any revision of assessment that may be made after the first, soils will not be revalued. In this way, the value of his improvements will be absolutely secured to the rayat, for they will afford no basis for the enhancement of the Government demand upon him, and the stability of his tenure will be assured."

In its order upon this report the Government of Lord Connemara said, *inter alia* (G. O. 4th July, 1889, No. 515):—

"The recommendation that legislation should be undertaken for the purpose of defining authoritatively the status of the rayat need not be noticed at length for it is made under a misapprehension of the real fact. . . . Nor has the Government any intention of revising the classification of soils. This principle has been repeatedly laid down, and is very clearly stated in the Settlement Manual. The statement to the contrary in the Manual of Administration is incorrect, and the re-classification of the Chidambaram Taluk is not a violation of the assurances of Government, as this Taluk has never been settled on the system now followed throughout the rest of the Presidency."

But all this has been changed. The financial difficulties of the Government have given rise to new policy and to new principles. In its order dated 11th May, 1895, the Madras Government, cancelling all its previous orders, laid down:

"At each settlement or re-settlement of a District, Government will fix at its discretion the period for which such settlement or re-settlement shall be in force. The Collector shall then notify the period in the *District Gazette*, and explain to the rayats that the new rates will not be liable to alteration during the currency of the settlement period; but that on the expiry of the said period Government reserves to itself the right to revise the assessments in such a manner as may then seem just and proper, either with reference solely to a rise or fall in prices, or with reference also to other considerations such as would require a re-classification of soils or a re-calculation of the grain out-turns. It should be further explained that Government will refrain from enhancing the assessment in respect of any additional value which may have been given to land by improvements effected by the rayats even if carried out by means of money borrowed from Government."

On these principles the re-settlement of Trichinopoly has been carried out. Over 111,336 acres of the best land in the district were brought under re-classification. In regard to 55,859 other acres in the district re-classification was suspended because "These lands are particularly poor and do not at present admit of any large enhancement of assessment." The admission of the Government that the increase of revenue—and not the interest of the rayats or that of the general taxpayers—is the inducement to these re-settlements, is noteworthy.

Nobody believes in the assertion that in these re-settlements scientific accuracy is aimed at. The amounts of additional assessment are fixed beforehand, and to arrive at these the Department manipu-

lates the figures and adopts a rough and ready method of adding to the existing rates. In the Trichinopoly re-settlement $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was added in a rough way without regard to the system of revision laid down in the manual and the result is that the increment is far from being evenly distributed over all different descriptions of land into which the arable area was originally classified. Thus in one case the percentage of increment per acre is 5 as. 5 p. and the actual 4 as. 10 p., whilst in another the figures are 3 as. 5 p. and 4 as. 7 pies respectively. The Tanjore revenue before the last settlement amounted to 41 lakhs. The settlement officers reported that "if the district were to be treated on scientific principles," the increase would be 28 lakhs, or 70 per cent. They had however not the heart to be too scientific, and suggested an increase of $18\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs, or 45 per cent. The Board of Revenue reduced the amount to $12\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs, or an increase of $30\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the Government further reduced it to $11\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs, or 28 per cent. Where is the scientific accuracy in all this process? We can only trace a guess as to how far the rayats can be safely squeezed to meet the exigencies of Government.

[Since writing the above, I have learnt at the India Office that the proposal to reduce the duration of settlements to twenty years has not been sanctioned by the Secretary of State, and that they would be fixed for a period of thirty years as hitherto.]

"CONCILIATION OR LITIGATION."

The following is the text of the draft Bill referred to by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., in his article "Conciliation or Litigation" printed in our last issue:—

DRAFT SECTIONS.

* * * And whereas with a view to bring about conciliation, Preamble Mad. and promote friendly feelings between the Reg. V of 1816. money-lenders and agricultural classes, and to diminish the expense of litigation and to render the principal and more intelligent and respectable inhabitants useful by employing them in administering justice to their neighbours, it is desirable that suits against agriculturists should be disposed of by Panchayats; * * * it is enacted as follows:

1. It shall be lawful for the Local Government to establish Bengal Civil Courts in any District, Panchayats to receive, try, Act, 1871, Section 3 and determine suits against agriculturists, and 18. The number of Panchayats to be established under this section shall be fixed and may, from time to time, be altered by the Local Government. The Local Government shall fix, and may, from time to time, vary the local limits of the jurisdiction of such Panchayats. The "Panches," or persons eligible to serve upon the Panchayats, shall be selected by the Subordinate Judge and an officer deputed by the Collector, in personal consultation with the people dwelling within the local limits for which the Panchayat is constituted. The lists of Panches shall be published in the *Government Gazette*. The Courts of arbitration constituted by Government under this section shall be called Panchayat Courts, and the members for the time being who are selected by the parties out of the list published by Government to act as arbitrators shall be called Panches.

2. In any District or part of a District in which Panchayats shall have been established under the last preceding section, it shall be lawful for the Local Government to declare, by notification in the *Government Gazette*, that on and after a

certain date all suits, in which an agriculturist is a defendant, shall be brought in the Panchayat within the local limits of which one of the defendants being an agriculturist shall, at the time of the commencement of the suit, dwell; and from the said date no Civil Court shall entertain any suit against an agriculturist dwelling within such District except as provided for in this Act, provided further that nothing herein contained shall affect the provisions of Sections 525 and 526 of the Civil Procedure Code. It shall be lawful for the Local Government from time to time to alter or rescind such notifications.

3. The jurisdiction of the Panchayat shall extend to all suits Madras Reg. V of brought against agriculturists, without limit 1816, Sec. 2, Cl. 1. as to amount or value. The ordinary rules of the Limitation Act shall be applicable to suits brought in the Panchayat. Provided that in suits brought to recover money lent or interest the period of limitation shall be 12 years from the time when the debt or interest became due. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to extend the period for suits already barred by any law for the time being in force.

4. The Local Government shall declare by notification in the Madras Reg. V of official Gazette the number of villages 1816, S. 10, Ho. Reg. which shall constitute the local jurisdiction VII of 1827, S. 4, Cl. 1. of each Panchayat. The officiating Patel and Kulkarni of each village shall be *ex-officio* Nazir and Clerk to the Panchayat as regards suits brought against any defendant dwelling in his village. It shall be the duty of the Patel and Kulkarni to receive plaints and to keep the register and proceedings of the Panchayat. For these duties they shall receive from the fees such remuneration as Government shall direct.

5. When a plaintiff desires to bring a suit he shall present Madras Regulation to the Patel and Kulkarni of his village a V of 1816, S. 4, Cl. 4. written plaint which shall state precisely the nature of the claim, the time when the cause of action arose, the name and residence of the defendant or defendants, the total amount or value of the property claimed, and all material circumstances which may elucidate the transaction. He shall also state in writing the names of the person or persons from the list of Panches, who he proposes should form the Panchayat for the trial of the suit.

6. On receiving the plaint the Patel and Kulkarni shall without delay send a village servant to call the defendant. If he fails to come they shall serve upon him a summons setting forth briefly the nature and amount of the claim, and fixing a day for his appearance to answer the plaint. When the defendant appears, the Patel and Kulkarni shall confront him with the plaintiff in the presence of one or more Panches; and it shall be the duty of the Patel and Kulkarni and the Panches present to exert themselves to the best of their power to induce the parties to come to an amicable settlement among themselves. They shall draw up a brief note of their proceedings and put their signatures to it. If parties cannot come to an amicable settlement, they shall ask the defendant whether he agrees that the case should be disposed of by the Panchayat; and if so whether he accepts as the Panchayat the person or persons named by the plaintiff. If the defendant is willing to have the case decided by the Panchayat but does not agree to the Panches proposed by the plaintiff, then each of the parties shall elect an equal number of Panches and shall jointly appoint one other person from the List as Sir Panch or Umpire.

6. (a) When there are more defendants than one, and all of them do not reside in the same village, the plaintiff may present his plaint to the Patel and Kulkarni of any one of the villages in which one of the defendants, being an agriculturist, may reside; and the Patel and Kulkarni shall arrange to summon the other defendants either through the Subordinate Judge within whose jurisdiction they may be residing, or the Patel and Kulkarni of other villages if they be situated within the jurisdiction of the same Panchayat.

6. (b) No Patel or Kulkarni shall take any proceedings in a suit in the subject matter of which either of them may be directly or indirectly interested as plaintiff or defendant; but on receiving the plaint in such a suit, they shall immediately report the matter to the Subordinate Judge, who shall thereupon appoint the Patel and Kulkarni of some other neighbouring village to be the Nazir and Clerk of the Panchayat with respect to such suit, and shall transfer the suit to them.

7. If any person on the Panchayat List, who has been selected by the parties, dies or is unable, or neglects, or refuses to serve, the party or parties who selected him may name a substitute. If a person selected neglects or refuses to serve without reasonable cause it shall be the duty of the clerk to report to the Subordinate Judge within whose local jurisdiction the case arises. The Subordinate Judge shall enquire into the

Mad. Reg. V of matter, and if he is of opinion that such 1816, S. 3, Cl. 1. person has neglected or refused without reasonable cause, he may fine him in a sum not exceeding Rs. 5.

8. When the parties are agreed as to the constitution of the Panchayat, such Panchayat shall proceed with all due diligence to take up the case. It shall commence its proceedings by requiring from the parties a "Razinama" or agreement in writing to abide by the decision of the Panchayat as above constituted. In investigating the matter referred to it, the Panchayat shall examine the documents and witnesses produced by the parties. It shall not, however, be bound by

Bo. Reg. VII of the formal rules of evidence, but shall adopt 1827, S. 4, Cl. 1. such mode of enquiry and proof as shall appear to it most conclusive to ascertain the facts of the case.

9. The parties shall ordinarily produce their own witnesses Bo. Reg. VII of and documents, and it shall be the duty of 1827, S. 4, Cl. 2. the Patel and Kulkarni to give the parties every assistance in their power to procure the attendance of the witnesses. The Panchayat shall also have the power to require the production of such documents or witnesses as they consider are essential for the proper decision of the case. In the case of witnesses neglecting to attend when called by the village servants, and in the case of witnesses resident in other villages, the clerk shall on the application of the party issue a summons which may be served direct or through the Subordinate Judge. Any person, upon whom such a summons has been served, and who disobeys such summons, shall be liable to the penalties stated in Section 174 of the Indian Penal Code. The Panchayat shall also have the power to administer an oath to witnesses before examining them and any witness who gives a wilful false evidence, while under oath, shall be liable to the penalties stated in Section 193 of the Indian Penal Code.

10. When both parties have been heard and the whole of the evidence gone through, the Panchayat shall pronounce an award according to justice and right. The award shall contain the names of the parties, the date of reference, the nature and value of the matter referred, and the decision made; it shall be dated and signed by the arbitrator or sole, otherwise by the majority which made the award, and by the umpire, if any. In cases of debt below Rs. 50 in amount, it shall be discretionary with the Panchayat to take down the depositions of the witnesses at full length or not, but in such cases, when depositions in full are not taken, it shall be the duty of the Panchayat to keep a brief note of the proceedings. In all other suits, the depositions shall be taken down in full and shall be signed by the witnesses, after they are read out to them and corrected if necessary, and the members of the Panchayat shall also sign the same.

11. Looking to the great advantages from a friendly settlement, it shall throughout the proceedings be the duty of the Panchayat to induce the parties if possible to come to an equitable arrangement among themselves. When a settlement is agreed to by the parties the Panchayat may pass an award in accordance with such settlement.

12. If the defendant does not agree to have the case tried by a Panchayat, or if the parties cannot agree as to the constitution of the Panchayat, the clerk shall call upon the plaintiff to pay within one month the Court fees due upon the plaint according to the law for the time being in force. If he pays the amount within the time, the case will be referred to the Subordinate Judge who shall try it at that place when he moves on circuit in accordance with the rules to be made in that behalf by Government. In cases when both parties agree or sufficient and special cause is shown to the satisfaction of the Sub-Judge to have the suit transferred, it may be tried in the station where the Civil Court is ordinarily held. The rules to be framed under this section shall provide that the Subordinate Judge shall go on circuit for 15 days in every

month except during the monsoon. If the plaintiff fails to pay the amount within the required time, the suit shall be struck off, and the time during which the plaintiff has been engaged in prosecuting his suit before the Panchayat shall not be excluded in computing any period of limitation.

13. When a suit has been reserved for trial by the Subordinate Judge, the Clerk shall forthwith report the fact to the Subordinate Judge within whose local jurisdiction the Panchayat is situated. When the Subordinate Judge has fixed the date on which he will visit the village on circuit he shall inform the Clerk who will have all reserved cases ready for trial on that day. The Subordinate Judge shall select one or more assessors from the Panchayat List, including among them if possible the one or more of the Panches who were present at the time when the amicable settlement was attempted and dispose of the cases brought before him. He shall record the opinions of the assessors, but the decision is vested exclusively in the Subordinate Judge.

14. All awards made by the Panchayat shall, within 3 days from the date of the award, be forwarded by the Patel and Kulkarni with all the papers of the case to the Subordinate Judge having jurisdiction to file them. The party who desires to have his award filed shall apply to the Subordinate Judge, who will direct the Kulkarni to issue notices to the other parties informing them of the dates when the Subordinate Judge will come on circuit to the village and require them to show cause why the award shall not be filed. The Subordinate Judge on his arrival shall hear all objections and, if no sufficient cause is shown, the awards shall be filed and shall have the force of decrees of the Court. If the Subordinate Judge decides that the awards should not be filed, the plaintiff will be called on to pay the Court fees within one month and have the suit disposed of as a reserved case by the Subordinate Judge under the last preceding section. If the plaintiff neglects to pay the fees within one month the suit shall be struck off, and the time during which the plaintiff has been engaged in prosecuting his suit before the Panchayat shall not be excluded in computing any period of limitation. In cases of emergency, when special and sufficient cause is shown, the Sub-Judge may at any time entertain an application to file the award and pass an order, after issuing notices to the parties and hearing any objections they may have to urge. The objections to the filing of the award must be of the nature of those specified in sections 520 and 521 of the Civil Procedure Code, and the award may be returned for amendment in the manner provided in Section 520.

15. If any party to a suit, which has been referred for trial to a Panchayat, complains that the suit is not being proceeded with with due diligence the Subordinate Judge shall enquire into the matter. If he is of opinion that the complaint is just, and if the suit has remained undisposed of for more than two months, he may assemble the Panchayat and dispose of the suit, he acting *ex-officio* as Sir Panch, with a casting vote. The award made will have the effect of an award under section 10. When the Subordinate Judge proceeds on circuit he shall examine the records of the Panchayats and shall advise and encourage them in the performance of their duties.

16. No appeal shall lie against the award of a Panchayat passed under this Act; but an appeal shall lie to the District Judge against the order of the Subordinate Judge directing an award to be filed or rejecting it.

17. When an award has been filed, the Subordinate Judge shall execute it in the same manner as one of his own decrees, but he shall as far as possible execute it through the village officers, who shall be bound to give all necessary assistance. Payments to the judgment creditor may be made in the presence of one or more Panches and a receipt in writing for such payments shall be passed and be countersigned by the Panches in whose presence they were made.

18. In the Panchayats the parties may appear by pleader Mad. Reg. V of or recognized agent as provided by the Code 1816, S. 2, Cl. 3. of Civil Procedure. They may also be represented by a relative, partner, gramansta, servant, or dependent, provided such person is provided with a vakalat-nama describing his relation to his employer and the matter in which he is empowered to act. Such vakalatnama must be filed in the suit. In the Panchayat no costs will be allowed on account of a pleader or agent.

19. Suits tried by Panchayats shall be exempt from fees, stamp duties, batta and all charges of every description, except that when a petition is made to file the award a fee will be charged according to such scale as may be fixed from time to time by Government, provided that it shall not exceed the proportion of four annas to every ten rupees of the value or amount claimed. In case of immoveable property the fee will be fixed according to its market value.

20. The District Court shall with the previous sanction of the High Court have the power to frame such rules, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as it may consider necessary to guide the procedure of the Subordinate Judges and the Panchayats. It shall also be the duty of the District Judge to exercise, as far as may be, careful personal supervision over the working of the Panchayats.

Mahadeo Rao Govinde Ranade, Sub-Judge, Nasick; Vishnu Moreashwar Bhide, Sub-Judge, Surat; Chintamon Sakharam Chitnis, Sub-Judge, Poona; Krishnajeo Vishnu Limaye, Late Sub-Judge; Shrinivas Shesho Hattibalgalkar, Late Native Assistant Revenue Commissioner, S. D.; Amrit Shripat Nagpoorkar, Sub-Judge Sangamner, Nagar District; Sadashiva Ballal Gounde, Late Assistant Inam Settlement Officer, S. D.; Krishna Rao Sadashev Jolekar, Sub-Judge Barsi, Sholapur District; Chintamon Rao Hari Deshmukh, Late Sub-Judge; Ganpat Amrit Mankar, Sub-Judge Khed, Poona District; Nowroji Dorabji Khandalawala, Sub-Judge Wadgaum, Poona District; Ganesh Wasudeo Joshi, Pleader, District Court, Poona District; Dinkar Ballal Chakradeo, Pleader, District Court, Sholapur; Govind Mahadeo Gadru, Pleader, District Court, Poona; Gangadhar Govind Gokhale, Sowcar, Poona District; Kevalehand Khubehand, Sowcar, Nasick District; Sitaram Hari Chiplonkar, Editor Quarterly Journal, Poona, Sarvajanic Sabha.

Poona, 23rd May, 1879.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1897.

- BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. "An Indian Romance; A Lesson of the Famine."
- CHAMBERS'S JOURNAL. Smith, Dr. George, "A Century and a Half of British Power in India."
- FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. Rock, Joseph, "The New Era in Hyderabad."
- FRANK LESLIE'S POPULAR MONTHLY. Forman, Florence F., "Locomotion in India."
- INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. Jardine, Mr. Justice, "Present Thought and Sentiment in India." Rogers, Alex., "Indian Sanitation."
- INVESTOR'S REVIEW. "Sir Charles Elliott and the Indian Famine Insurance Fund."
- MONTH. Dunn, S. H., "A Wedding and a Burial in India."
- MUSICAL VISITOR. Lewis, Dr. J. H., "Hindu Music."
- NINETEENTH CENTURY. Lyall, Sir Alfred, "India under Queen Victoria."
- UNITED SERVICE. "The Indian Mutiny in Fiction."
- UNITED SERVICE MAGAZINE. Pearse, H. W., "Kafiristan"
- WESTMINSTER REVIEW. "India and Her Friends."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1897.

- CLUTTERBUCK, REV. G. W. "In India (The Land of Famine and of Plague) or Bombay the Beautiful, The First City of India." (The Ideal Publishing Union.)

- HUNTER, SIR WILLIAM WILSON. "Annals of Rural Bengal." (Smith, Elder & Co.) 7s. 6d.
- BRANDIS, SIR DIETRICH, F.R.S. "Indian Forestry." (Oriental University Institute, Woking.)

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

HOUSE OF LORDS PAPERS:—

- [58.] EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPER-ANNUATION—Bill to remove doubts as to the power of the Secretary of State in Council of India to grant Superannuation and Compensation Allowances in certain cases to Officers on his Establishment. 0s. 1d.
- [61.] REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS' FUND—Bill to make provision for the transfer of the Assets, Liabilities, and Management of the Regular Widows' Fund and of the Elders' Widows' Fund to the Secretary of State in Council of India, and for other purposes in relation thereto. 0s. 1½d.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPORTS AND PAPERS:—

- [151.] EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND)—Return of, for the half year ended on 31st March, 1897. 0s. 0½d.
- [182.] EAST INDIA (APPOINTMENT OF NATIVES)—Correspondence regarding the Appointment of qualified Natives to certain Posts in the Educational and other Departments hitherto held by Europeans. 0s. 1d.
- [217.] ARMY (DISEASE)—Return of the Amount of all Classes of Venereal Disease (including simple Venereal Ulcers) for all Stations where the Act was in force, from 1861 to 1883; and similar Return from 1886 to 1895. 0s. 0½d.

PAPERS BY COMMAND:—

- [3382.] EAST INDIA (CONTAGIOUS DISEASES), No. 2 (1897)—Memorandum by the Army Sanitary Commission, and Correspondence, regarding the Prevalence of Venereal Disease among the British Troops in India. 0s. 1d.
- [3386.] INDIA: OUTBREAK OF PLAGUE—Papers relating to the Outbreak of Bubonic Plague in India; with Statement showing the Quarantine and other Restrictions recently placed upon Indian Trade, up to March, 1897. 0s. 11d.
- [3388.] FAMINE AND RELIEF OPERATIONS IN INDIA—Further Papers regarding the Famine and Relief Operations in India during the years 1896-97. (In continuation of [3302]) 2s. 3d.
- [3401.] EAST INDIA (CONTAGIOUS DISEASES), No. 4 (1897)—Despatch to the Government of India regarding the Measures to be adopted for Checking the Spread of Venereal Disease among the British Troops in India; with Appendix. 0s. 1d.

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of Magdalen College, and Secretary of the Appointments Committee in the University of Oxford, acts as Guardian to persons coming to England for Education, and gives information as to the methods available of Education, General and Professional. Address Secretary, INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools), 44, High Street, Oxford, England.—(Advt.)

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JULY, 1897.

SOME LESSONS OF THE FAMINE.

UNDER the title "Permanent Preventives of Famine" the *Times* has lately published a series of articles by its well-known writer on Indian Affairs which are noteworthy in themselves as well as for their appearance in a journal too often associated with the rigidly official point of view. Despite an evident intention to give the Government full credit for what it has done the writer is forced by the course of his able enquiry to the following conclusion: "Let it be frankly acknowledged that the Indian Government has ably and loyally performed the task assigned to it in 1877. But we now see that that task did not comprise the whole work which lay before the British rulers." If one consents to waive for the moment the important question of the Famine Fund and its suspension, one may concur in this conclusion. The prevention or alleviation of famine falls naturally under four heads; (1) Increase of food supply; (2) Distribution of food; (3) Organization of relief; (4) the strengthening of the staying power of the people. The first end may be achieved by irrigation, which increases the yield of cultivated areas in times of drought, or by extension

of the area of cultivation through the reclaiming of uncultivated tracts. Irrigation has of course been carried out to a large extent, and further works are in progress. But the other and no less important method has been neglected. A hundred millions of acres are "declared to be waiting for cultivators." How to get the fifty millions of "degraded cultivators" to the acres awaiting them is a problem which Lord Dufferin's enquiry of 1888 in vain attempted to solve. "The net conclusion is that 'private enterprise will effect the movement of the people only on a small scale, and that the difficulties in the way of state-conducted migrations on a great scale are almost insuperable.' As long as the problem 'continues to be discussed by the revenue department, and in the spirit which 'normally guides that department, little progress seems likely.' Private capital will, we are assured, be forthcoming to effect the much-needed re-distribution of population, but on reasonable conditions. One of these conditions, however, is a boon which a grasping and extravagant Government finds it impossible to grant, namely fixity of tenure. Much has been done it is true by private enterprise in one or two districts, notably the Doonars. "But for the 'grudging policy of the Government, always with 'one eye to the relief of its congested districts and 'with the other eye to what it can itself make by 'the transaction, these movements towards North-Eastern Bengal would, it is said, have taken place 'on even a larger scale.' Only in the light of these facts is it permissible to talk of the over-population of India. "The over-population of great 'areas in India has passed into a proverb." There is a saying which places a low estimate on the intelligence of quoters of proverbs. Obviously no district can be populated beyond the limits of its productive power in normal years. To argue that India is over-populated because in a year of drought these "congested districts" feel the pressure of famine is not less absurd than to argue that England is over-populated because wretches are found starved to death in the slums of big cities. Competent authorities affirm the existence of plentiful supplies of grain in India at the present moment. The difficulty is to bring it within reach of the hungry mouths at prices not altogether prohibitive.

This problem of distribution again subdivides. Railways have been and are still being constructed to facilitate the transport of food to population in accordance with the scheme drawn up twenty years ago. But the converse aspect, the redistribution of population, which is involved in the cultivation of hitherto uncultivated areas, has received very insufficient attention. Thus the Nagarkatta Road, which every year takes off 20,000 labourers from the congested districts of Bengal to

the tea gardens, could not be protected against floods because the revenues of the province had been confiscated at the end of the quinquennial period by the Imperial Government. "The case is merely an example of how the free migrations of the people are impeded and the action of British capital as a preventive of famine is checked by a faulty system of finance." Truly, what the Government does with one hand it undoes with the other. It has supervised the large migrations to Assam in the interest of the labourers with results that are said to be excellent, and encouraged and facilitated similar movements to Mysore, Ceylon, and Burma. These migrations within the limits of India, if conducted under favourable conditions, might amply suffice to dispel the baseless fears of over-population, that nightmare of Anglo-Indian economists. But finding that on the present scale internal migrations could not effect the necessary amelioration, Government has endeavoured to supplement them by encouraging the emigration of indented labourers to foreign countries and the British colonies. Yet on the other hand by starving the provincial administrations, and by permitting the colonies to prevent the immigration of Indian artisans, clerks, and the like, the Imperial Government puts a check on the action of its own remedial measures. As INDIA has already pointed out, there are vast districts in Africa which can only be developed by Indian labour, and many others which can be more economically served thereby. Free emigration would confer no less a boon on Africa than on India, and this consideration alone ought to guide the Imperial authorities to a decision, even if bare justice to our fellow subjects did not clearly indicate the only possible solution of the question between India and Africa. In truth, "an issue of more grave import was never placed before the Imperial Government of Great Britain." While such incongruities in administration exist it cannot be considered sufficient that the elaborate Famine Code drawn up to provide for the third safeguard against famine should by grappling successfully with the difficulty of feeding four millions of destitute Indians deserve in the main the encomiums showered upon it. The delay in recognising the existence of famine, and the wilful ignorance of the authorities on certain points such as the loss of life by famine, are no faults of the Code, to which one ungrudgingly assigns all the praise due.

Finally the staying power of the people may be strengthened. "The staying power of a people depends upon the normal prosperity of a people; its prosperity on calling forth the material resources of the country." Evidently therefore no single measure or series of measures can be proposed which shall secure the object in view. That can

only be attained by a sound financial policy. To those who follow the vagaries of Indian finance it will be no surprise to find that this most important remedy against famine has received least attention. Such schemes as can be aired in Parliament, and pointed at as proofs of the earnest endeavours of the Indian Government to further by every means in its power the prosperity of the people, are energetically pushed forward, and money is always forthcoming. "When the most conscientious of Viceroys, Lord Mayo, found it his duty in a great financial crisis to suspend this conspicuous class of expenditure, he exclaimed 'We have played our last card!'" But without the host of minor works which act as feeders to the great undertakings of the Imperial Government, the latter lose their efficiency, and some of the consequences are seen in the unprofitable working of some of the great railways. Political interests guarantee the performance of promises and plans which can be paraded in the eyes of the British public. But no such potent considerations ensure the efficient carrying out of provincial works, such as the making of roads and bridges, reclamation of waste ground, building of river embankments and the rest. These merely mean prosperity or poverty to the villager of the district in which they are carried out, or neglected for lack of funds. "The great interests—the commercial interest, the steam navigation interest, the railway interest, and the giant department of Public works—take care that the Imperial machinery shall suffer no interruption. The not less important provincial machinery is subject to a series of rude checks and jars, and to being completely thrown out of gear whenever the Supreme Government of India wants money." The comparison of the provincial governments to a sheep, which at the quinquennial census is "close clipped" and shorn of its wool and turned out to shiver till "its fleece grows again," has become deservedly famous. The provincial governments are unanimous in their condemnation of a system which has in its results so far diverged from the purpose of its originator. Parsimony and extravagance, the two most costly methods of conducting financial operations, are alternately encouraged. Whatever merits Lord Mayo may have perceived in his system have not been allowed to develop, thanks to the fatuous and extravagant military policy which was inaugurated some six years after the institution of the new method of arranging the quota of revenue assigned to the provincial governments. "Continuity is essential to economic progress," and "we cannot truthfully assert that the State has done all that may be fairly expected of it to avert famine while the whole machinery of district development, by which alone the material resources of the country

"can be drawn forth and the staying power of the people strengthened, is thrown out of gear for the first half of each five years and carried on during the second half in fear of the next dislocation."

ALEXANDER THE GREAT.¹

It has been the fate of Alexander, even more than of Hannibal, to furnish "a theme for declamation" to the schoolboys of successive generations. When and where his brilliant career and its abrupt ending first became a stock subject for moral and historical essays is a question which only admits of conjectural answers—perhaps in the schools of Alexandria, not very long after his death. But Livy had evidently written about him at school, and in mature life he set himself in highly academic fashion to discuss the probabilities of Alexander's defeat, if he had turned his arms against Rome. Quintilian gives specimens of the themes that he furnished to the Roman schools, and Hamlet apparently learnt to moralise on him at the University of Wittenberg. Coleridge, in his delightful reminiscences of his Christ's Hospital days, tells of the persistence with which some of his schoolfellows introduced him into their exercises, whatever might be the theme :

"Was it ambition? Alexander and Clytus! Flattery? Alexander and Clytus! Anger? Drunkenness? Pride? Friendship? Ingratitude? Late repentance? Still, still Alexander and Clytus! At length the praises of agriculture having been exemplified in the sagacious observation that, had Alexander been holding the plough, he would not have run his friend Clytus through with a spear; this tried and serviceable old friend was banished by public edict in *saecula saeculorum*."

If Coleridge's "very sensible, though at the same time very severe, master" came back to life, he would not find it necessary to re-issue his edict. Perhaps no more signal instance could be found of the breaking with the past in educational methods that has characterised the latter half of the nineteenth century than the fact that for the first time probably since the death of Alexander in 323 B.C., schoolboys are growing up in ignorance of his fame and achievements. The modern side boy barely hears his name; even the boy who is still taught on classical lines is apt to imagine that Greek history ended with the triumph of Sparta in 404 B.C., or at least with the death of Epaminondas in 362, and if he proceeds to Oxford, and reads Ancient History for "Greats," the chances are that he will be confirmed in the notion. If, however, he begins to read about Alexander for himself, he will be startled at

the outset by a strange conflict of opinion. Demosthenes's description of Philip as "no Hellenic, and not even a respectable barbarian" is admittedly, and was, perhaps, felt to be at the time, a rhetorical exaggeration. But, whereas Grote could write of Philip's son that "in respect of disposition and purpose no one could be less Hellenic," to the latest historian of Greece "he represents the culminating point of Greek civilisation in his achievements and in his character." After all our modern striving after historical impartiality, it is evident that we fail to escape from our own political bias. To Grote, Hellenism means Athens and the free institutions of Athens; he has all the old Greek hatred of despotism, and is almost ready, in consequence, to follow the lead of Thucydides in asserting that the tyrants achieved "nothing of importance." To Holm, Alexander is the forerunner of the German Kaiser of to-day, and Eumenes of Cardia, mis-called Alexander's "chief Secretary," is really his Chancellor, his indispensable agent in the organisation of a great Empire. Edward Freeman's admiration for Alexander, which was unmistakeable, may seem somewhat surprising in an English Radical. It is explained by the fact that Freeman's imagination identified the Persians with the "unspeakable Turk," and Alexander, their conqueror, with the champion of the Christian peoples of south-eastern Europe.

The difficulty of passing any just verdict on Alexander's life-work is largely increased by the inadequacy of the ancient records. For the fifth century we have Herodotus and Thucydides; for the first half of the fourth, Xenophon and the orators; but for Alexander's career we are left without contemporary guidance, and have to fall back upon Arrian, a respectable historian, but writing in the time of the Emperor Hadrian and without the help of modern canons of historical evidence. Still, out of the dimness certain points emerge fairly clear. First, his personal bravery and adventurous spirit are undoubted. So is a certain chivalry in his treatment of enemies of high rank, of Darius and his family and of Porus. This characteristic gives him some affinity to the favourite knights of the Middle Ages, and has largely contributed to his popularity. Again, his consummate generalship is undisputed. The only fault alleged against him as a general is that he was too careless of his own safety in the field. Philip has the credit of having organised the Macedonian army, with the "phalanx" that proved so terribly effective at Chaeronea; but Alexander's achievement of harmoniously combining very different elements in the same army, on a scale never attempted before, was at least as great. He saw that the strength of the Asiatics lay in their cavalry, and he beat them with their own weapon.

¹ "The History of Greece." By Adolf Holm. Translated from the German. Vol. III. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

Lastly, there is some agreement as to his possession of certain faults of character, though Holm minimises the evidence against him, omits to mention the massacre of the Branchidae, and thinks that his alleged drunkenness was only compliance with Macedonian custom and that the execution of Parmenio may not have been a judicial murder.

But when we pass from the consideration of his personal character and his purely military performances to estimate the lasting value of his work, the divergence of views between historians becomes extreme. To Grote he is a barbarian conqueror, the destroyer of the free city life of Greece, not the Helleniser of Asia but the Asiatiser of Hellas. Freeman finds in him the avenger of the wrongs of Hellas upon Persia, who is forced by the necessities of conquest into identifying himself with the Persian emperor whom he has overthrown, and who also betrays the inability to endure unmeasured success which had ruined so many Hellenes before him. With Holm he takes the place occupied by Julius Cæsar in Mommsen's history of Rome. He is the consummation of Greek history, the completer of the work that was only half done by Athens.

It is evident that different political principles are at the bottom of these diverse estimates. What is the best political gift the gods can give to the world? "A hero to rule over it"—We are all familiar with Carlyle's favourite answer. And if the actual flesh-and-blood conqueror approximated at all to the ideal hero, we might be ready to join in worshipping him. But in practice the conqueror is often so sadly unheroic, so much more of a destroyer than of a builder-up. Nor is it right to credit him with all the good results that may in the end have flowed from his upheaval of humanity. An earthquake, which spreads destruction through a country, may conceivably benefit it in the long run by altering its physical configuration; but it is not therefore a conscious moral agent, nor to be glorified as such.

By the spread of the Greek language through Western Asia, Alexander paved the way for Christianity, which was disseminated in the Greek tongue through the Asiatic centres of Greek culture. By breaking down the barrier between East and West, Alexander gave an impetus to commerce that must have had far-reaching effects in the civilisation of the world. In Alexandria he founded a city, whose importance as a centre of commerce and of culture cannot be exaggerated. But the first of these results was obviously wholly, and the second in great part, beyond his ken; it is perhaps only as the founder of cities and the geographical explorer of the far East that he deserves any large measure of the gratitude of humanity. If we try to set over against his ser-

VICES the sum of his evil doing, we involve ourselves in a question as problematical and academic as that which Livy propounded. Yet it is necessary at least to state it. What was the value of the free city life that he destroyed in Greece? If, as has been asserted, "there was more political life in a single generation of a Greek city than in five or six centuries of mediæval monarchy," does not the destruction of that life outweigh all the benefits with which he ought in fairness to be credited? The question can never be answered, because we can never know how much life still existed in the Greek states. That life may have been dying of exhaustion; Demosthenes had bitter complaints to make of the apathy of his fellow-citizens; but it is hard to believe that a city or a country was exhausted when it produced a Demosthenes.

INDIAN DELEGATES IN ENGLAND.

IMPORTANT CAMPAIGN IN THE CONSTITUENCIES ENTHUSIASTIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS

The visit to this country of the Indian gentlemen selected to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure has been turned to admirable account by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress. Upon the arrival of Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer it was felt that such time as they could spare from the laborious duties connected with their evidence before Lord Welby's Commission would be best employed in conducting a campaign in the constituencies of the United Kingdom and explaining to British electors at first hand the trend of Indian opinion with regard to the problems of Indian administration.

There were, it is true, many circumstances which tended to discourage the project. For example, the season of the year was quite the most unsuitable for the purpose. Political meetings in the United Kingdom are confined as a rule to the months between October and March on account of the well-known difficulty of obtaining audiences during the cricket season. More than that, public attention, so far as it was not absorbed in athletics, was on this occasion occupied partly with the Græco-Turkish question abroad and with preparations for the "Diamond Jubilee" at home. It would, indeed, have been hard to find a less encouraging moment for an Indian campaign. Yet the British Committee resolved to make the most of the opportunity, and their efforts, backed by the indefatigable exertions of Mr. Surendra Nath, Mr. Wacha, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer, have succeeded beyond the most sanguine expectations. A circular, previously printed in INDIA, inviting public bodies, especially political associations, to arrange meetings, was widely distributed, and the response was in a marked degree favourable. The following table will

show at a glance the meetings which have been held:—

DATE.	PLACE.	SPEAKERS.
May 13.	Lambeth.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor Gokhale and Mr. Subramania Iyer.
„ 19.	Sunderland.	Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee.
„ 20.	Clapham.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee.
„ 23.	Belper.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. H. N. Haridas, and Mr. J. P. Goodridge.
„ 25.	Mile End, London.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee and Mr. D. E. Wacha.
„ 26.	Hastings.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Professor G. K. Gokhale, and Mr. J. P. Goodridge.
June 3.	Dewsbury.	Mr. Subramania Iyer and Mr. K. N. Chaudhuri.
„ 4.	Dublin.	Mr. D. E. Wacha and Professor Gokhale.
„ 12.	Lewisham.	Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer.
„ 14.	Hackney.	Mr. D. E. Wacha and Professor Gokhale.
„ 16.	Gloucester.	Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. D. E. Wacha, and Professor Gokhale.
„ 20.	Acton.	Professor Gokhale.

In addition to the above, Professor Gokhale and Mr. Parameswaran Pillai are to address a meeting at Peckham on July 2.

Everywhere the Indian speakers have obtained a most enthusiastic reception. The audiences were delighted with their eloquent speeches and everywhere express a strong wish to hear the speakers again. Nothing could well be more encouraging than the sympathetic spirit which was shown on every side, and it goes without saying that this brief campaign will be followed up on a larger scale. One of the most important duties of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress is to carry into the British constituencies the war against the bad side of bureaucracy in India. When an Indian comes into contact with a British audience he realizes, as he has never done before, that, whatever may be the views of the governing classes in India or in London, the wrongs of Indians are hotly resented by the general mass of the British electorate.

We give below some extracts from the speeches delivered at the various meetings. Limits of space prevent us of course from attempting anything like a full report. But it may be noted that the meetings were on the whole well—in some cases remarkably well—reported in the newspapers.

MEETING AT LAMBETH.

Mr. J. Herbert Roberts, M.P., presided at the meeting held in the Wheatsheaf Hall, South Lambeth Road, on May 13. In addition to the speakers mentioned above there were also present Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. W. S. Caine. We

take the following from the speech of Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee:—

MR. SURENDRA NATH BANERJEE paid a generous tribute to British rule in India, the bright side of which, he said, the Indian people were by no means wishful to overlook. They were deeply grateful for its inestimable blessings. Great as had been British achievements in the arts and civilisation, they dwindled into nothing when compared with the services rendered to India, not least among which was to be reckoned the new impetus which had been given to public life in the Eastern Empire. But he had to complain that the Government of India was a Government conducted by officials for the benefit of officials, who added to their salaries at a time when the country was in financial straits, whereas an increase of 75 per cent. in the salaries of native officials, recommended ten years since, had not yet been made. In all matters connected with the Government of India the British people had a deep responsibility; but they were too often heedless of the wants and woes of those whom they were called upon to rule. They did not inquire into the conduct of their officials, as was the case under the Honourable East India Company. He regretted the discontinuance of these scrutinies, and passionately prayed for their resumption by Parliamentary Committees. Everything possible ought to be done to remove the cause of famine in India—namely, the extreme poverty of its people. It had been an act of supreme wisdom on the part of the British nation to send relief to the famine-stricken, for by so doing they had effectually tightened the bond connecting the two peoples. The enormous military expenditure (this year £23,000,000) was sucking the blood of the Indian Empire. Already 70 millions had been spent on defensive works on the frontier, whereas the true scientific frontier lay in the hearts of a grateful and contented people. From his childhood he had heard of the coming “Russian invasion.” If its day ever came, the people of India were ready to die in defence of their Sovereign. They knew what Russian domination meant for many of them—exile to Siberia and political extinction. After criticising the enormous sums credited to “home charges,” the speaker animadverted on the great disproportion between the civil offices conferred on Europeans and those given to Indians, the latter having only 60, as compared with 900 held by English employees.

MR. DADABHAI AND MR. SURENDRA NATH AT SUNDERLAND.

“Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji,” said the chairman at the Sunderland meeting on May 19, “had served Finsbury in the last House of Commons, and they could but hope he would serve some other constituency in the same place.” We take the following from Mr. Dadabhai’s speech:—

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI said that it was very important that the question of India should be thoroughly understood by the British people. The misfortune of India was that, while the British people were anxious that justice should be done to India, the authorities to whom the people delegated their power to govern India went upon a different line altogether, and it was this fact that they wished to impress upon the British people. It was laid down in 1833 that there should be no difference made in regard to any British subject by reason of race, creed, or colour. This was what Indians wanted; to be treated equally with every other British subject; that her people should be treated as British citizens, and not as British slaves. (Applause.) After the mutiny they had their great charter in the proclamation of the Queen, in which the same principle had been laid down with every emphasis, and that was at the Jubilee of 1887 confirmed. All this proved that, so far as British people and Parliament were concerned, they wished India to be governed on righteous principles, but the executive had fallen into a groove and could not get out of it. Lord Salisbury once said that the proclamations made with regard to India were only so much political hypocrisy. (Applause.) If England were subjected to the treatment India was subjected she would not stand it for one day, but would rebel against it. Let them suppose what it would be if all their departments—all their Government—were in the hands of foreigners, who carried away from the country

whatever they could save and whatever pensions they drew. The result must be that the country would be kept constantly bleeding and would eventually be bled to death. Two hundred million rupees were paid to European agencies year by year, of which nothing returned to India: nearly two-thirds of the revenue went out of the country. No country on the face of the earth was to-day poorer than India, and every year large numbers died from starvation. This was not creditable to British rule, and there was no reason why such a state of things should exist. If England were only just and honourable to India the benefit to herself would be ten times greater than it was to-day. If India could save to herself what she produced, she would, with the immense resources that the country possessed, be able to buy English goods to a greater extent than England would be able to supply them. In India Britain has an immense market of people who were civilised, when the inhabitants of these islands were roaming savages. (Laughter.) India was grateful for the lesson Britain had taught her, that the people were not created for the king, but that the king was the servant of the people; but in order to be subjects and not slaves they must have a voice in their own affairs; they must be governed on British principles, and not on despotic lines. India desired to feel that she was governing herself under theegis and control and supremacy of Britain. He hoped they would use their influence in support of India's appeal. (Applause.)

Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, in the course of a speech which the *Sunderland Daily Echo* described as "most eloquent" and "magnificently eloquent," said that the Indian National Congress

constituted the Liberal party in India. It was something like their own great Liberal Federation, only perhaps more thoroughly organised. When it first met in Bombay, in 1885, there were 75 delegates, and at the meeting in Calcutta last year there were 1,300. The party these delegates represented took their stand on the great principle of no taxation without representation, and as British subjects they claimed British citizenship, and asserted that their Government ought to be on strictly representative lines, and that the higher appointments ought not to have the exclusive monopoly of the ruling race. The Government of India was conducted by officials for the benefit of officials. He denounced the existing system of exchange allowances, and said that the duty of this country to India was not adequately performed by making it over to a body of officials into whose conduct no shadow of scrutiny was instituted. Many officials were his friends, and he esteemed them highly, but they were the victims of the system with which they were connected. India paid in home charges 24 millions a year, the whole of which left the country without any return of any kind, and that drain had been going on for the last fifty years. Charges which in the free-governing colonies were borne by the home executive were in regard to India drawn from the Indian Exchequer. They paid for the construction and maintenance of the India Office, but the home government built and maintained the Colonial Office. Among the charges which had been made on India was one by which she had been required to maintain a lunatic asylum in England. This, in consequence of protest, had been discontinued. There were 28,000 Englishmen against 11,000 natives drawing salaries from 1,000 rupees per year and upwards, and the Englishmen drew £15,000,000 and the Natives £3,000,000. Out of 980 vacant appointments, 800 were held by Europeans and 60 by natives, and there were but 100,000 Englishmen in India and 300,000,000 natives. He pointed to the glorious history of the race to which he belonged, and asked for justice for the millions of his fellow-countrymen. Many of them had been taught to admire the writings of the great English masters of political philosophy, and had been fed upon the strong food of English constitutional freedom. England was about to celebrate the 60th year of the most glorious reign the world had ever witnessed. There could be no nobler celebration than by the practical recognition of the fact that the people of India were British subjects than by extending to them the British franchise, by conferring on them that heritage of civil rights and freedom which had made England what she was.

MEETINGS AT BELPER.

On Sunday, May 23, three meetings were held at

Belper, Derbyshire, where Mr. H. N. Haridas, in conjunction with Mr. John Smedley, has for some time, and with conspicuous success, expounded "the Indian view of Indian questions." The speakers on May 23 included Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. H. N. Haridas, and Mr. J. P. Goodridge. Mr. Surendra Nath, in the course of his speech, said:—

He was prepared to acknowledge many blessings which had been derived from that rule under which the dry bones of the valleys of India had become instinct with life, but at the same time he had not come there to sing their praises. Their official experts would do that; they were past-masters in the art, and speaking of the officials introduced him to one of the first of the grievances. Whilst the country was groaning under a load of taxation, these officials, whose salaries could be calculated by thousands of rupees, added to their salaries by what is known as the exchange compensation allowance. In spite of the disastrous famine which was raging these highly-paid European officials continued to draw this exchange compensation allowance. The allowance was made because of the reduced value of the rupee, and it cost the people of India a million and a half to make up that loss. But, whilst these European officials had this loss on the value of the rupee made up not a single native of India was entitled to the allowance. The native official might have his family in this country, he might be, many of them were, educating their families in this country, he might have to make remittances to this country, but all the same he was not entitled to the exchange compensation allowance. Those who made that invidious, insulting, and irritating distinction forgot that both races came from the same source. He maintained that the Government of India was conducted by officials for the benefit of officials, and as self-adulation was the law of Nature they could not blame those officials personally for giving to the English people their version of the government. But he was come to present the other side. Their primary grievance was that the people of England knew so little about the government of India, and what was still worse, they cared so little about their great dependency in the East. They had a great and solemn and a consecrated trust which they had received from Providence, and that trust was not adequately performed by haggling it over to officials into whose conduct they made not a shadow of enquiry. These officials were the irresponsible monarchs of all they surveyed.

MEETING AT HASTINGS.

The *Hastings and St. Leonards Times* printed a two-column report of the meeting held at Hastings on May 26, when the speakers were Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. J. P. Goodridge, and the following resolution was carried:—

That this meeting rejoices in the existence of the Indian National Congress, and believes in the wisdom of conferring larger representative powers upon the people of our greatest dependency.

Professor Gokhale, in the course of his speech, said:—

They were perfectly sensible of the bright side of British rule, but they wanted their grievances redressed. (Applause.) He would take only the circumstances with regard to taxation and expenditure. One of the most fundamental principles of taxation was that necessities should not be taxed, and yet absolutely one of the prime necessities of life was not only taxed but over-taxed. Two pounds of salt cost 2d. to manufacture, and on that there was a duty of 2s. 6d.—2,000 per cent. In England £10,000,000 was spent for education, but in India the sum was only half a million, and then the Government thought they are over-spending, and talked about cutting it down. Every child in this country attended school, but in his own country 88 or 89 out of every 100 were growing up in ignorance, and yet the Government said it was doing more than it ought to do. He was not exaggerating. In conclusion, he said they were often told that Indians were Englishmen, and the position had been taken up that the English Government and the Indian Government were in

partnership, but it reminded him of the partnership of the giant and the dwarf, where everything went to the giant, and the dwarf had what was left, and that was nothing, because the giant wanted it all. (Applause.) That sort of thing could not last long. Promises had beguiled them for so long—during the last 60 years nothing had been done. Lord Lytton had said that the promises were very inconvenient. If, however, Englishmen would realise their responsibility, things would be better, and the partnership between the two countries would be a real one. (Applause.)

Mr. Goodridge, after regretting that the speeches of their distinguished Indian visitors had not been delivered in the House of Commons, said that "he had returned from India three months ago, and the state of affairs as described by the previous speakers did not represent a tithe of what they really were. The people had been reduced to the last stage of poverty, and it was no exaggeration to say that they had died by thousands—they had died by tens and hundreds of thousands."

The question came—they had impoverished the country, how were they to improve it? It could only be done by reform and retrenchment. The taxes were not spent to improve the country, but, on the contrary, there was a large expenditure every two or three years on expeditions, and in that way the resources of the country were squandered. The administration was carried on in far too expensive and extravagant a style. An appeal had been made to the British people for help, but one would suppose that the Government would try to be as economical as possible that the country's own resources might supply the people in food and clothing: but the Government officials at the present moment were up amongst the hills of Simla, leaving the people in the plain to get on as best they could. What would Englishmen say if all the members of the Cabinet, all the judges, and the highest officials went away from the capital and spent eight months of the year in Scotland or four months in the Engadine and Switzerland? Simla was further away than the places he had mentioned. It was a shame—(applause)—at a time when they knew that the people of India were dying in such quantities; they could not know the feelings of the people or the sufferings they endured, while they were up in the hills of Simla.

MEETING AT GLOUCESTER.

A highly successful meeting was held at Gloucester on June 16. It was organised by the Gloucester Women's Liberal Association, and the speakers included Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P. (Chairman), Professor Gokhale and Mr. D. E. Wacha. An excellent report of the meeting was printed in the *Gloucester Journal* of June 19. Sir W. WEDDERBURN, having remarked upon the liberal way in which the county and city of Gloucester had contributed to the Indian Famine Relief Fund, said that

he was sure they would be glad to know not only how that suffering could be mitigated, but how they might strike at those causes which had made the suffering possible. He and others believed that with proper arrangements in India not only would famines be impossible, but that the country would be very prosperous indeed. There was a terrible famine in India 20 years ago, and the official record of deaths gave a total of five and a half millions. He regretted to say that a larger area was affected by the famine now raging, and they had yet to learn the terrible mortality that would result. If in time of peace such a calamity was possible, there must be something very wrong in the conditions of India. (Hear, hear.) There they had a vast population of frugal, industrious people—they were frugal and industrious in the highest degree—they had a very rich soil and a fine climate; and the people were very skilful cultivators and agriculturists. A country like that ought to be very wealthy indeed, and should produce conditions which would not only be beneficial to India but to the masses of this country who carried on trade with it.

Instead of that, however, the people of India were so miserably poor that the failure of one harvest caused that terrible mortality. If they existed under reasonably good circumstances, or anything beyond a state of pauperism, they would be able to withstand the failure of one crop without dying of hunger. What they wanted to know was, what was the cause of that poverty, and the native gentlemen present, who now came to England for the first time, would deal with that question. Those gentlemen, who belonged to the educated class in India, were the product of our schools and colleges. One of the best things we had done for India—and he did not deny that much good had been done for the country—was to give it education. He regretted to say that the amount given for education was terribly niggardly, especially in comparison with the enormous sums spent upon useless and mischievous military extravagance; but something had been done in the way of education, and the result had been most beneficial. That education had raised up a class of men who were really the pillars and support of our administration there. Those educated men knew perfectly well that the only possible government for India at the present time was the British, and, therefore, they were strongly attached to the British Government; they knew that if the British Government left India to-morrow either anarchy would result or a despotism power like Russia would take possession of India. The best proof of the regard which the educated class had for British rule was their great desire to improve it, and make it more suited to the needs of the people. They desired to make it more sympathetic, so that the people might be made prosperous and contented; for until the people were made prosperous and contented there was no real, strong foundation in India for British rule. (Applause.) That criticism which pointed out the weakness of our rule was the best and most friendly support that such men could give to the Government of this country. He might say that the members of the Royal Commission upon Indian expenditure (to which he belonged) were most strongly impressed not only with the value of the evidence that was given by the gentlemen who attended as delegates from India, but by their moderate and reasonable tone, and the great knowledge of affairs which they showed. (Hear, hear.) Sir William concluded by dwelling on the great responsibility which the people of this country had with regard to India, and speaking of the necessity there was for the people to have a voice in the management of their own affairs.

Professor GOKHALE (who wore Indian costume) said in the course of his speech that:—

He would mention a few facts about the famine, and leave his hearers to draw their own conclusions. The first question that would strike people was as to why there should be such a famine in so vast a country after so many years of British government. Englishmen were very fond of saying that they gave the innumerable blessings of peace to India; and they all admitted that they had had peace. But if they had had peace for a hundred years, why should those famines come so frequently upon the land, and especially when it was acknowledged that the people were exceedingly frugal, industrious, and quiet? Let his hearers put the question to themselves, and he was quite sure it would not be easy for them to give an answer unless they went deeply into it. India at one time was entirely different from what it was now. Though the people were at the present time almost down to the lowest point of the wheel of fortune, at one time—many centuries ago—the country was the chosen abode of wealth, religion, philosophy, and all that went to make life happy. Long before anyone heard of Rome, Athens, Babylon or Carthage, India was acknowledged to be the foremost nation in the world of civilisation: but it had gone down a great deal, and it was for the electors of Great Britain to consider whether it should always remain at the low point at which it now stood, or be raised up as had been so solemnly and so often promised. The question of the Indian famine must arouse interest in the Indian problem in this country in a very remarkable manner. He knew that the people of Gloucestershire had responded nobly to the appeal which was made to them, and on behalf of his country he tendered them his most sincere thanks. But, after all, when they had responded in that handsome manner, he must say they had not done the whole of their duty in the matter. The spectacle of a people suffering from starvation

like that which was witnessed in India, was something extraordinary; and if the ultimate responsibility for it came home to Great Britain, then surely the electors of this country ought to consider why it was that such a spectacle should be possible and whether there were any remedies by which that phenomenon might be prevented. . . . The suffering that had been caused by the present famine was terrible. At the present time there were between three and four million people on the relief works, and for every man who went to them there were ten persons who were quietly suffering and dying at home, because, on account of caste distinctions they feared loss of status. He had visited some of the relief works and had seen skeletons there—men who were simply bundles of bones working from morning till eve under the scorching rays of the oriental sun—which would haunt him to the last day of his life. If his hearers were told that the Government had done and were doing so much, it must be remembered that that was only one side of the shield. No doubt the Government were doing something to relieve the sufferers, but it must not be forgotten that the famine was brought on, more or less by the Government's own action—by their unsympathetic administration of the laws. Merely palliating the effects of their unsympathetic administration did not get rid of their responsibility in the matter. Under normal conditions the life of the mass of the people was one of darkness and gloom; they had to toil and moil from dawn to dark, and many passed through life with an insufficiency of food. It had been estimated that between fifty and seventy millions never knew what it was to have their hunger fully satisfied from year's end to year's end. Their life was one of universal gloom, not cheered by a single ray of light or hope, and ultimately they became so desperate that they really did not care what happened to them. Even if they were able to save a little, there were the exactions of the Government and of the money-lender, so that what they put by was of no value to them.

Passing on to consider the remedies, Professor Gokhale said:—

With regard to the remedy, his hearers would agree that no people could be so well governed as by men who knew them well. The British rule had done a great deal of good for India, but a great deal more had been promised; and if those promises were faithfully and honestly carried out India would certainly have a great future, just as it had had a great past. It all depended on the manner in which the British nation carried out the promises which had been made to the Indian people. He admitted most unreservedly that the intentions of the Government were good—that the Government did not want the people to die by hundreds of thousands; and what was asked for was a fulfilment of the pledges so often made. The electors of this country were the ultimate arbiters of the destinies of the people of India, and yet they appeared never to give a moment's thought to Indian questions. It was not that they did not sympathise with their sufferings; India was not mixed up in their daily life. The electors of this country thought that there were people who were in charge of the Indian Government. As a matter of fact there were, and the result was they were living under a despotic and perfectly irresponsible government by Indian officials, whose interests were to take care of their own positions, who did not care so much for the welfare of the people, and did not care to know what the wants and wishes of the people were. Many of them even did not know the language, and did not mix with the people. The only remedy was to allow the people of the country to have a larger voice in the administration of its affairs. More than 60 years ago this country promised that the people of India should be raised to a level of equality with the other subjects of the British Empire; but if they considered the present situation, they would find there was all the difference in the world between the positions which the English and Indian subjects occupied. It was true they were both under British rule and the British flag, but beyond that there was very little in common between them. The children of the soil in India were merely hewers of wood and drawers of water. In questions of legislation and taxation they had practically no voice; their laws were made for them by officials.

Mr. D. E. WACHA, in the course of his speech, said that

the land revenue assessment was very high, and was beyond

the ability of the cultivators of the soil. For the last hundred years the assessments had gone up higher and higher every time. The assessments were revised every 30 years, and whatever improvements the cultivator had made were, as it were, swept away for the benefit of the Government. Even the subsoil water was taxed. The cast-iron system of the Government, whereby the land revenue was demanded from the cultivator on fixed days, led to the most disastrous results in the case of the latter; if his crops were not ready and he could not pay, he was either sold up or he had recourse to the money-lender, and between the two he was ground down in such a way that his condition never improved. He (the speaker) had been reading an account of the progress which had been made during the 60 years in which the Queen had reigned; and, he asked, what had been the material condition of India—was it progressing? He said ruefully that it was deteriorating and going from bad to worse. There was no better illustration of that statement than the present famine. Former famines had come and gone, and, somehow or other, the cultivator was able for a time to resist the scarcity of food, and would only go to the relief works three months afterwards, perhaps; but this time, the moment it was known that there was a deficient rainfall people became apprehensive, and in the first or second week after the rains were over every one of the poorer classes had to go to the relief works. That fact showed the people had no staying power. The people were so poor that a little taxation was burdensome, whilst the ability to pay very heavy taxes was hardly to be found anywhere. Having given instances of the oppressive character of the salt tax, Mr. Wacha showed how the land had become poorer and poorer by reason of manure being used for fuel since the forests had been reserved by Government, and remarked on the large military expenditure, the greater portion of which for the last ten years had been on fruitless and unrighteous wars. Those little military scares on the borders were pure myths, and vast sums of money were spent on those "frontier fireworks." The natives of India would be quite contented with British rule if only the Government would be more in sympathy with them and relax their oppressive laws. But whilst so much money was spent on military matters domestic reforms were neglected. The great black spot in the administration of the country was the land laws, which greatly needed amendment. The interests of India were indissolubly bound up with those of Great Britain, and it was to life electors of this country that the natives looked for justice.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON AND THE INDIAN DELEGATES.

The following appeared in the *Standard* of May 24th:—

The Secretary of State for India has had his attention drawn by a correspondent to the statements made by four native gentlemen, delegates of the Indian National Congress, at a public meeting recently held at Lambeth, with a view to rousing the people of the United Kingdom to the preception of the grievances under which, it was alleged, the native population of India are suffering. The reply of the Secretary of State to the communication of his correspondent was as follows:—

"India Office, Whitehall, S.W., 21st May, 1897.

"Dear Sir,—I regret not to have leisure to discuss at length the various topics raised in your letter of the 14th, but I would point out that there is nothing in the criticisms you mention which really touches the fundamental principle on which the Government of India is based. This principle is that the British authority is responsible for the protection of the country from external attack, and for the maintenance of internal order; and so long as this responsibility rests with the British authority it is impossible for any Government to take steps either as to the frontier policy or the organisation of the internal administration of the country, which would be inconsistent with the discharge of its fundamental obligations. To withdraw the forces on the frontier or to introduce a system of representative government would be fatal to the external safety of the country and the maintenance of order internally. As to your specific questions, I send the following answers:—

"1. The home charges represent the interest on the capital

invested in India, the pensions, etc., of the officers who have given their lives to the service of India, and the value of such stores as cannot be procured in that country. It also includes the cost of the system of the Home Government, established by the Act of 1858. Without British capital and without British officers India, as we know it, would cease to exist.

"2. As to India being the poorest country in the world as the result of the 'salt and income taxation,' it is sufficient to point out that, taking the present value of the rupee at 1s. 8d., the incidence of the salt tax per head of the population at 4½d. to 5d. per annum, and that out of a total revenue from taxation of about £18,500,000 (being at the rate of less than 1s. 7d. per head per annum), only £1,156,000, or a little more than one penny per head is derived from income-tax, from which, moreover, the poorer classes are exempt. As a matter of fact, India judged by the standard of other Asiatic countries, is not a poor country. For instance, the imports of gold on private account, and not for purposes of coinage, during the last ten years, have averaged annually more than £2,500,000.

"3. The reason why India pays for the cost of the home Government is, apart, from questions of policy, that there is no reason why the taxpayer in this country should be called upon to bear this burden, while India is financially perfectly able to bear the charge herself.

"4. As to the cost of lunatics charged to Indian revenues, I must point out that the net charge in 1896-97 was £4,600, and not £30,000, as you have been informed. I am unable to see why, if pensions are to be given, as I think they should be, to officers incapacitated for further duty by injuries or disease contracted during service in India, those whose disability takes the form of insanity should not receive a suitable provision. Under the present system, lunatics are pensioned in the same way as all other officers invalided; but under the rule of the East India Company (which was abolished by the Act of 1858) special provision was made for lunatics, and the net charge of £4,600 mentioned above is incurred in fulfilling the engagements of the East India Company.

In conclusion, I must express the opinion that it is useless to eulogise in the abstract the blessings of British rule in India, and then propose to destroy that which alone makes British rule possible and beneficent.—I am, yours faithfully,

(Signed) "GEORGE HAMILTON."

The following reply, which the newspapers with a curious notion of fair play appear to have boycotted, was forwarded to Lord George Hamilton:—

Hotel Victoria, London,
May 28th, 1897.

To The Right Honourable LORD GEORGE
HAMILTON, Secretary of State for India.

My Lord,—Our attention has been called to a letter signed by your Lordship which appeared in the *Standard* of Monday last, regarding certain criticisms which we had ventured to make at a public meeting at Lambeth, in connexion with the present system of Administration in India. The views which we put forward at that meeting are shared by the educated classes in India, and they deserve earnest and careful consideration on the part of those who are responsible for the good government of that country.

Your Lordship seems to be of opinion that the reforms which our educated countrymen recommend would be inconsistent with the fundamental policy of the British Government in India, which is the maintenance of internal peace and the protection of the country against external aggression. We desire respectfully to join issue with your Lordship in this matter, and we are firmly persuaded that if the reforms which the Congress advocate were given a fair trial, the great objects which the present

policy of the Government professes to secure would be far more effectively promoted. It need hardly be observed that any policy which promotes general contentment and satisfaction will secure internal peace and ensure security against foreign aggression in a better sense than any system based upon mere military force.

There are some obvious misapprehensions in your Lordship's letter with regard to what was said at the meeting, and the general views of the Congress party in connexion with the forward frontier policy of the Government. Nobody has suggested the withdrawal of the troops from the *natural* frontiers of India, but we protested at the meeting against the recent extensions of the frontiers, which in the opinion of several competent military critics, unconnected with the Government of India, have not only weakened the natural defences of the country, but have seriously dislocated our finances, pledging us moreover to vast and undefined liabilities in the future.

Further, at the meeting it is true that considerable stress was laid upon the poverty of the Indian masses, but nobody even suggested that it was the result of the Salt Duty and the Income Tax. As regards the Salt Duty, it was observed that being a tax upon a prime necessity of life, it was open to grave objection, which was accentuated by the fact that the Duty on Salt is at present 2000 per cent. of the cost of production, and that therefore it was most oppressive in its incidence on the poorest of the poor; and in this view of the matter we need quote no better authority than your Lordship, who, two years ago, admitted in the House of Commons the extreme hardship entailed upon the people by the salt tax, and therefore it is with no little surprise that we now read what appears to be something like a vindication of the salt duty.

As regards the Income Tax, what was insisted upon at the meeting was that the taxable minimum was too low, being about £30 a year, and that it should be raised. When it is borne in mind that in England the taxable minimum is £150, it will be readily conceded that the suggestion is not an unreasonable one. No doubt considerable stress was laid upon the increasing Home Charges. We felt that in doing so, we only represented Indian sentiment, which was indeed largely shared by the Anglo-Indian community.

Your Lordship will perhaps remember the trenchant and incisive criticism which Sir Griffith Evans made from his place in the Supreme Legislative Council in connexion with many of the items included in the Home Charges.

As Sir George Wingate remarked in connexion with these Home Charges:—

"The taxes spent in the country in which they are raised are totally different in their effect from the taxes raised in one country and spent in another. . . . In this case, they constitute no mere transfer of one portion of the national income from one set of citizens to another, but are an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount drawn from the taxed country."

If the Home Charges are incurred to meet, among other things, the cost of stores purchased in this country, and to pay for pensions in respect of ser-

vices rendered in India, it is not difficult to see what the remedies would be. The employment of a larger indigenous agency in the public service of India would reduce the pension charges paid in this country. The purchase of stores in India to a greater extent than is the case at present would go far to diminish the charges under this head in this country.

In conclusion, we desire to call attention to the remark which your Lordship has been pleased to make to the effect that it is no use our extolling British Rule when we seek to destroy everything which can make that rule possible and beneficent. We desire to point out that we regard the British connexion as being highly beneficial to India, but our complaint is that the form of government which exists now in India prevents the people from reaping the fullest benefits to be derived from that connexion.

The Congress party seek to remove those features in British Indian Administration which interfere with its usefulness and beneficence. If the British connexion is to be permanent, as we pray it will be, the government must cease to be a military despotism—its foundations must be shifted and its policy and its principles must be in harmony with popular ideals, hopes, and aspirations. This is the great work which the Congress has set before it, and in this work it confidently appeals to the sympathies of all Englishmen, no matter to what party they may belong.

We have the honour to be,

Your Lordship's Obedient Servants.

SURENDRA NATH BANERJEA,
Member, Bengal Legislative Council,
and Secretary, Indian Association,
Calcutta.

D. E. WACHA,
Joint General Secretary, Indian National
Congress, and Secretary, Bombay
Presidency Association.

G. SUBRAMANIA IYER,
Delegate, Mahajana Sabha, Madras.

G. K. GOKHALE,
Secretary, Deccan Sabha, Poona.

INDIA AND THE DIAMOND JUBILEE.

The following letter appeared in the *Times* of June 7th:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Times*.

Sir,—Will you permit me, through your columns, to ask whether the British people do not desire that this auspicious year should, if possible, be made an occasion of rejoicing to the millions of their fellow-subjects in India? The people of India cherish a strong personal attachment to her Majesty. For the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 is regarded by them as the Magna Charta which pledges the British Government to a just and sympathetic rule; and they will never forget that in personally directing the terms of that Proclamation she used these gracious words:

"The Queen would be glad if Lord Derby would

write it himself in his own excellent language, bearing in mind that it is a female Sovereign who speaks to more than a hundred millions of Eastern people on assuming the direct government over them, and after a bloody civil war giving them pledges which her future reign is to redeem, and explaining the principles of her government. Such a document should breathe feelings of generosity, benevolence, and religious toleration, and point out the privileges which the Indians will receive in being placed on an equality with the subjects of the British Crown and the prosperity following in the train of civilisation."

Further assurances of goodwill were conveyed to the Indian people at the Jubilee of 1887. And this occasion of the Diamond Jubilee offers an opportunity altogether unique and becoming for striking the imagination and kindling anew the affection of a quick-witted and impressionable people, by associating with the name of their gracious Sovereign some great boons which will never be forgotten. The present suffering state of the Indian masses is an additional reason for such bold and statesmanlike action. In painful contrast with the exuberant prosperity of her other dominions, India lies prostrate under famine and pestilence. Is this not a time specially indicated for motherly solicitude and an attempt to console and cheer countless desolated homes?

Doubtless her Majesty's advisers will propose the conferring of personal honours upon individuals. But I trust they will not consider that their duty on so great an occasion ends here. Such personal honours, if bestowed on those Indians whom their fellow-countrymen regard as their friends, will, no doubt, be welcomed in India. But what is now wanted is something more real. To bind India closer to this country requires boons which will benefit the masses, which will tend to their progress and well-being, political and social, moral, material, and intellectual. Ten years ago the Jubilee assurances were followed by an expansion of the Legislative Councils; and thus, by tentatively introducing the representative element, the voice of Indian public opinion was allowed to make itself heard in the making of Indian laws. This reform has produced nothing but good. Why not go a little further on these safe and practical lines? Again, the cultivating classes are now in the deepest depression and suffering. Why not strengthen their feeble knees by granting them fixity of tenure and limitation of the Government demand, as recently advocated in your columns? This would give them now life and be a permanent benefit to the country. By the great educated class, by whom three generations have grown up in our schools and colleges, and who control public opinion in India, no grievance is more felt than their exclusion from high and honourable office in the service of their own country. Why not, in this matter, give practical effect to her Majesty's assurances in the Proclamation of 1858, that all her subjects shall equally be granted the public employment for which they show themselves fitted? Lastly, the Indian people desire that the old practice should be revived of periodical enquiries into Indian administration, as it is from these

enquiries that date all the principal measures which have tended to the contentment and prosperity of the people.

I hope and trust that these considerations are occupying the mind of her Majesty's advisers. Lord Salisbury, with Lord Eddesleigh, by the restoration of Mysore did a great work, strengthening our position in India. Will he not, as Prime Minister, rise to the present great occasion and advise her Majesty to signalise the Diamond Jubilee by some striking mark of her confidence in and benevolence towards the millions of her Indian subjects?

I have, etc.,

W. WEDDERBURN.

House of Commons, May 31.

A conference of Indians resident in the United Kingdom was held on Saturday, June 12th, at Montague Mansions (facing the British Museum). The object of the gathering was to consider and adopt a congratulatory address to her Majesty (Queen Victoria, Empress of India, on the occasion of her "Diamond Jubilee." The London Indian Society, with whom the idea originated, succeeded in bringing together many Indian ladies and gentlemen now residing in this country. The meeting was presided over by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

The CHAIRMAN, who was very cordially received, said that they as Indians had a great deal to thank her Majesty for in regard to the influence she had exercised on their behalf. (Cheers.) Four years before her Majesty came to the throne an Act was passed giving them certain rights of citizenship, which they, in its altered form, regarded as their Magna Charta. During the Queen's reign she made the charter far more powerful and extensive than it was under the original Act of 1835. (Hear, hear.) That Act merely provided that British subjects should be treated without regard to class, creed or colour in respect of the service of his Majesty, who then reigned; but the proclamation of the Queen in 1858 included not only the British, but the Indian subjects. (Cheers.) Throughout the whole of India the prince and the peasant had gracious pledges given them, and with this righteous Act her Majesty's name would remain joyfully associated for ever. (Cheers.) The Magna Charta of India was given graciously and spontaneously by the Queen. (Hear, hear.) It was one of the brightest episodes in British Indian history that her Majesty had taken an important part in carrying out the pledges given in the charters in reference to the restoration to Mysore of a native prince, and Mysore was now a flourishing native state. They had great reason to be thankful to her Majesty, and on this most glorious occasion they might reasonably ask for some further exhibition of the loving care which she had always manifested towards them.

An address had been drawn up by the executive committee of the London Indian Society, and the chairman moved its presentation.

Mr. T. J. DESAI, in moving the adoption of the address, in a short and eloquent speech said that British rule was endeared to the Indian mind. He hoped that the two countries would be brought closer together every day in the bonds of fellow-feeling and mutual attachment.

Mr. H. S. KHALIL seconded the motion, which was ably supported by Mr. D. E. WACHA, delegate from Bombay, Professor G. K. GOKHALE, from Poona, and Mr. G. SUBRAMANIAM, from Madras. The resolution was carried amidst loud and prolonged cheers.

Mr. S. Z. A. BALEMI moved that the chairman be authorised to sign the adopted address on behalf of the conference. The motion was seconded by Mr. H. MULLICK and then unanimously carried.

Mr. N. B. CHATTERJI moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was passed with cordial cheers, and the proceedings terminated.

We add the text of the address adopted at the conference:—

ADDRESS

To Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, and Empress of India, etc., etc.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY—

WE, the Indians resident in the United Kingdom, in public conference assembled, loyal and loving subjects, re-joicing in the approaching sixtieth anniversary of your Majesty's accession to the Throne, desire to approach your Majesty with our most devoted attachment and heartfelt congratulations on this great and auspicious occasion.

WE recall with gratitude the gracious words of your Majesty's Proclamation of the 1st of November, 1858, which we regard as the Magna Charta of our rights, spontaneously granted by a beneficent Sovereign for the good of her people. Your Majesty was then graciously pleased to declare that you held yourself bound to us by the same obligations of duty that bound your Majesty to all your other subjects; and in 1887, on the occasion of your Jubilee, your Majesty reiterated your generous pledges.

THUS your Majesty's assumption of the Government of India was rendered memorable by the issue of the glorious Proclamation of 1858, and on the auspicious occasion of the Jubilee of 1887, by a small expansion of the Legislative Councils—introducing a partial representation in them—which gave to the people an opportunity of making known their needs and aspirations. We now, therefore, at the Diamond Jubilee, approach your Majesty's Throne with the prayer that your Majesty will be pleased to celebrate this unique occasion by the bestowal of some further marks of the loving care of your Majesty for your Indian subjects, and crave permission to indicate briefly the boons which we believe would be most gratifying to the Indian people.

HAVING regard to the success which has attended the practical working of the generous concession, by which the representatives of the people are partly associated in the making of their laws, we humbly pray that this noble policy may be still further extended by so increasing the numbers of the representative members of the Councils, that the different Provinces of this vast Empire may be adequately represented—by giving them a larger voice in the Financial Legislation of the country—and so improving their status as members of the Councils, that they may render still more effective aid to the Government in their labours for the welfare of the people.

FURTHER, we recall with gratitude the gracious words of Your Majesty's Proclamation:—"And it is Our further will that, so far as may be, Our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in Our Service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge." And we pray that in accordance with this expression of Your Majesty's beneficent intentions, the Resolution of the House of Commons of the 2nd of June, 1893, bearing on this subject, may be given effect to, with

a view to the wider employment of the people of India in the service of their own country.

AGAIN, looking at the terrible suffering entailed by Famines in India, we pray that the cultivators may be granted the boon of fixity of tenure and legislative limitation of the Government demand, in order to give them courage and confidence in the pursuit of their industry.

FINALLY, looking to the fact that India has no representatives in the Imperial Parliament, and in order that Your Majesty may, from time to time, be fully informed of the condition and needs of Your Majesty's subjects in India, we pray that You may be graciously pleased to revive the former practice of holding periodical Parliamentary Enquiries into Indian affairs, a practice which in the past has been fruitful of good results.

AND WE PRAY to the Almighty Giver of all good that Your Majesty may long be spared to reign over Your people in Your world-wide Empire.

ANGLO-MUHAMMADAN LAW.

These volumes constitute one valuable part of the outcome of Sir Roland Wilson's fourteen years' tenure of the Readership in Indian Law at Cambridge. It argues not only diligence in his academic office, but also a strong interest in the subject, that he should have undertaken to set forth in a plain exposition the complexities of such a difficult and far-off branch of the law. To our mind, he has succeeded in far larger measure than any of the writers that have attempted to deal similarly with the Hindu law; but it is to be remembered that their task is a vastly more complicated and extensive undertaking. He also appears to us to have handled the material with more efficiency than any of his predecessors in the same line; perhaps because he has brought to the work a more powerful scientific equipment, and a deeper grasp of legal principle and practice. Though placed at some disadvantage by lack of familiarity with Indian life at first hand, he still seems to have entered into the situation in a manner creditable to his sympathetic insight. It is further unfortunate that he should not have been able to address himself to the legal works of Muhammadan law in the original texts; but it may be hoped that, in so far as he has fallen short on this fundamental ground, the deficiency may be made up by some competent native scholar, either in the form of particular criticisms or in an independent work covering the whole ground. These able volumes, at all events, offer a fair and worthy challenge. They do immense credit to the author, and such credit is reflected upon the University of Cambridge.

Sir Roland Wilson proposed to himself to remedy two deficiencies. There was, he thought, "first, a lack of suitable introductory matter, to smooth the path of the beginner who approaches the subject with the ordinary intellectual outfit of English law-

students; and secondly, insufficient recognition of the curiously composite character which the so-called Muhammadan law of modern India, has gradually come to assume under European manipulation." To the first point is directed, in the main, the historical "Introduction" first-mentioned above; the second is provided for in the "Digest," which deals with the law in precise and detailed form, so as to meet the requirements of advanced students and practitioners. Looking then, in the first place, to the interests of students, and in the second place, to the desirableness of forwarding the work of Indian codification, the author has aimed at "directing attention simply and solely to what the British Government at the present time requires to be enforced as law for its Muhammadan subjects, and for them alone; falling back on the Muhammadan authorities, translated or untranslated, only where the point has not yet been covered by legislation or judicial decision." It is essential to note definitely the limitations thus laid down. They are undoubtedly just limitations, and they weaken very sensibly the regret that the author finds it necessary to disclaim knowledge of Arabic and original research. For in order to the determination of a civil suit in Muhammadan cases in British India, the original sources have ceased to be, as a rule, the most important. Thus, Sir Roland Wilson says:—

"The Courts are bound to accept the inferences drawn from the Koran and the traditions in the standard medieval textbooks in preference to what might appear to the judges a more correct inference. But, again, the secondary medieval sources are of less weight (for the purpose aforesaid) than the previous practice of the Courts of British India. In other words, a judge is not at liberty to decide a point of law according to his own reading of a medieval Muhammadan treatise (the Hedaya, for instance) in opposition to a single decision of the Privy Council, or to a series of decisions of the High Court which he represents or to which he is subordinate."

The scope of Sir Roland's "Anglo-Muhammadan Law," then, is materially different from the scope of Sir Syed Ameer Ali's "Mohammadan Law, compiled from authorities in the original Arabic." He puts the position very clearly in a single sentence:—

"British statesmanship determines from time to time how much of Oriental precept is to be treated as Law in the English sense, how much left to the consciences of those who acknowledge it as religiously binding, how much forcibly suppressed as noxious and immoral: and when this has been determined, European scholarship sifts and classifies the Oriental authorities, the mental habits of English and Scotch lawyers influence the methods of interpretation, and Procedure Codes of modern European manufacture regulate the ascertainment of the facts and the ultimate enforcement of the rule."

And when he speaks of scholarship and lawyers as above, he means to include native scholars and native lawyers that follow European methods; which, it may be added, not a few of them do with conspicuous ability.

The historical volume starts with Mahomet and the Koran. Before the Prophet's time there was little government and still less law among the Arabs, individual or tribal aggressiveness being dealt with by social agencies—religion, public opinion, and the natural disposition of the peaceful and fair-minded. The Koran itself is well described by Sir Roland as "a religious miscellany with some legislative matter embedded in it"; and there is much room for

¹ "An Introduction to the Study of Anglo-Muhammadan Law." By Sir Roland Knyvet Wilson, Bart., M.A., LL.M. "A Digest of Anglo-Muhammadan Law." By the same Author. (London: W. Thacker and Co.)

development of the interesting contrast between the course of such a composite and final code and the course of the Roman Decemviral code, which had already severed religion from law and left the door wide open for the future. "The promulgation of the Koran by Abu Bekr," then, "was substantially the act of an organised political society, imposing rules of conduct upon each and all of its members, to be enforced in case of need by its collective physical force." The post-Koranic development takes two lines—orthodox and unorthodox. Sir Roland traces in the orthodox (Sunni) line the growth of the jurists, the Maulawis, or professional expositors of the Shariat, a class curiously analogous to the Roman *iurisperdentes*, and pursues in some detail the divergencies of the rival schools of the Moslem *ulama*—the Kanafi, Maliki, Shafai, and Hanbali—concluding this section of his narrative with an account of the Hedaya, as representing "the orthodox view of the Sacred Law at the period of its fullest maturity and approaching decay." He appends to this section an interesting enquiry as to the juristic character of Muhammadan Law from the point of view of Austin's analysis of Law and Sovereignty. The unorthodox line of development brings under consideration the Motazalas (separatists) and more especially the Shias. The next stage is the application of Muhammadan law in India under Muhammadan rulers, the pre-eminent point being the series of reforms engineered by Akbar, with the reaction commenced under Jehangir and Shah Jahan and completed under Aurangzib. This brings us at last to the history and present footing of Anglo-Muhammadan Law, under a professedly Christian Government. Considerable space is devoted to the Patna case, which read emphatically the lesson that "the law to be administered to the natives of Bengal must be accommodated to their habits and expectations, and must not be simply English law transplanted whole." It needs an English headstrongness to give such a preposterously elementary principle an opportunity for contested enforcement. There is no necessity to follow here in detail the various steps of this historical development.

It remains only to express sympathy with Sir Roland's urgent advocacy of the official codification of the Anglo-Muhammadan Law. Happily there is no reason to suppose that there would be the least popular objection: on the contrary, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan many years ago declared in the Legislative Council at Calcutta that there was a general desire in favour of the step among the native population. Our Anglo-Indian administrators can hardly be so stupid as to lay stress upon the exploded notion that a code stereotypes the law in cast-iron. They have had personal experience to the contrary, besides what they ought to know of the history of the Roman and French codes. The present "Digest" of Sir Roland Wilson's drafting would form a most substantial and important groundwork, calculated to facilitate indefinitely the labours of a Commission. It would be futile to deal with particular points here. Let it suffice to say that we have tested it at numerous crucial points and found it right true. Both the "Introduction" and the "Digest" have evidently

been composed with uncalculated labour and care, and must prove immensely serviceable for the purposes for which they were specifically designed. The results are sharply conceived and lucidly expressed. Even a layman with a little legal penchant would find a variety of curious interest in the multifarious problems of discussion.

A STRONG-MINDED HINDU.—II.

By W. MARTIN WOOD.

Vishvanath's special civic service began with the modern Corporation of Bombay, established by Sir Bartle Frere in 1865. This was a nominated body, at the head of which was a Civilian Commissioner appointed by the Government, who had, in effect, all the financial and executive power in his hands, leaving only review and criticism for the members. In this duty the Rao Sahib was prominent from the first. After a few years' trial that system broke down; and in 1872 a reformed Corporation, including a Town Council, was established on something like the European plan, with a considerable elective element. Vishvanath was an elected member of this body from first to last, and he was chosen Chairman (something like our mayors) of the Council, which position he occupied in 1879, during Sir Richard Temple's term as Governor, though he had strongly opposed certain measures which Sir Richard forced on the city. The civic courage and vigilance he displayed all through these fifteen years were such as would have done credit to any of our municipal leaders in this ancient land of burgesses and civic freedom. The story of these struggles and services is a long one; but the Rao Sahib's bearing through it all is admirably summarised by his biographer—in terms which the present writer can confirm from close personal observation:—

"He performed his duties with an independence, an even-handed impartiality; and yet with an overflowing courtesy which elicited for him the respect and admiration of his colleagues, European and Native alike. His whole work in the municipality was, indeed, a noble record of which anyone could be proud."

Abundant testimony to this effect was given on the day of his death, when, as a mark of respect, the Corporation adjourned after passing a unanimous resolution recording its sense of the loss sustained. The chairman, in moving the resolution, remarked *inter alia*:—

"He was a steady and consistent advocate of wise reform, and did much to advance the cause of local self-government. When the Municipal Act of 1872, which widened the business of self-government in this city, was drawn up, he was consulted, and his advice was of considerable service."

In seconding the resolution, Dr. Blaney—who had in this work been associated with him all through—after testifying to the earnestness and self-sacrificing public labours of the departed councillor, said:—

"All the votes he ever gave, all the speeches he ever made in this Corporation, were for the progress of municipal institutions, and for the working of local self-government with success. In this respect he truly seemed to me to possess the spirit of an Englishman."

In 1874, in (the late) Sir Philip Wodehouse's time,

he had entered on the wider stage of public life, being selected as a member of the Legislative Council of the Bombay Presidency, which position he thrice occupied to the great satisfaction of the whole community of Western India. It is said of him in that capacity—

"We see how he became a model 'guardian' of the interests of the people in the Council. Prominent in 'Opposition' as he was, he possessed the esteem of his official colleagues, who could never possibly hope to cower him down to meek obedience or cringing acquiescence. An attempt of this kind was once made by a Governor too well known for his impulsiveness to require special mention [Sir R. Temple], and in answer he [the said President of Council] was politely requested to remember that he was no longer in the Central Provinces."

In 1884 Vishvanath was called up by the Marquis of Ripon to the higher stage of the Supreme Legislative Council. Being the first Indian from the Western Presidency who had received that honour, it was recognised as such to themselves by his fellow-citizens, who gave him a public entertainment at which were represented, as he acknowledged, "all the leading members of the communities of Bombay." It was presided over by Sir Jamsetji Jijibhai. In his speech of congratulation to the Rao Sahib, the Parsee baronet, after expressing the general satisfaction that the right of that Presidency to be represented in the Viceregal Legislative Council had at length been recognised, said that satisfaction had been greatly enhanced, and that such recognition

"had found its fulfilment in the selection of so worthy and qualified a representative as yourself. . . . In your nomination we recognise the sincere desire of Lord Ripon's Government to call to his Council real representatives of the people—men, like yourself, who can render useful service to the public cause. Your nomination is thus as honourable to those who have made it as it is honourable to yourself, and is gratefully appreciated by all classes of the people."

On Vishvanath's journey eastward he was welcomed at Nasik and other stations on the way, and his arrival at Calcutta was the occasion of an enthusiastic demonstration by the Indian associations of that city. It was under the Marquis of Ripon that he had been appointed to the Supreme Legislature in 1884, and in 1886 he was nominated under Lord Dufferin. During this comparatively brief period of work in the chief legislative chamber of India he, as is remarked in the memoir, "fulfilled the expectations raised of him; he fully justified his selection, and won laurels fresh and glories new." But it would require an exposition of his treatment of the Bengal Tenancy Bill, the Local Government Act, and the Income-Tax measure to do justice to the painstaking and discrimination shown by the Rao Sahib in bringing his extensive experience to bear on those difficult subjects, and such expositions cannot be entered upon here. His attitude in dealing with the former of these measures might be taken as illustrating at once the solidity and reasonableness of his character as a public man. Himself a landholder (a Khete of the Konkan), he was a tenacious defender—occasionally to excess, as some of us used to think—of proprietary interests in land; but in his trying labours on the protracted Tenancy Bill discussions he was careful to respect the claims of the cultivating rayats, and met the demands of the tenant-right cultivators of Bengal in that spirit of compromise and desire for abatement of friction

which was characteristic of the practical statesman. At one of the critical stages of this legislative struggle, he said:—

"My lord, I am quite sensible of the imperfections which there may be in my work; but I can assure your lordship and my colleagues that I have devoted more hours to it than one is usually credited with doing in this climate. If there are any sides of the question on which more light can be thrown, nobody would be more glad to learn than myself; but I have a right to say that I have done my best under the circumstances."

The occasion of his retiring from the Legislature was not neglected by the Rao Sahib's fellow-citizens in December, 1887. At a large meeting held at the Petit Hall, Sir Dinshah, who presided, in his opening remarks, said of him:

"He has all along possessed the confidence of the people and the Government and has discharged his duty by both in a remarkably able, effective, and independent manner."

The leaders of the Banian community also testified to the same effect. It was resolved to found a permanent memorial to Vishvanath's name and public services. This was done by the subscription of a considerable fund establishing an annual prize of a gold medal, to be awarded by the University of Bombay, to the best essay connected with Sanskrit literature; also for a bust placed in the Hall of Convocation. This is a peculiarly suitable memorial—the Rao Sahib being connected with the University from its earliest active existence: his name stands as first of its scholastic Fellows under the date of 1862. As member of the Senate, Syndic, and Examiner he was identified with the University to the last. Sir Raymond West, as Vice-Chancellor in 1888, said of him,

"His name is to remain for ever on the golden book of this Institution. He will be enshrined amongst its best and most deserving men, uniting within himself the attributes of a Sulpicius, a Varro, and a Mæcenas, with the fame of them all."

It is not for me here to express any opinion on, but this is the place to mention, the Rao Sahib's great work on that part of the Hindu Civil Law which obtains in western India and other Mahratta provinces. It consists of Yajnyawalkya's "Smitri" and Nilakantha's "Vyawahara-Mayukha." These volumes comprise, besides the Sanskrit text carefully edited by Vishvanath, a clear English translation, with an introduction which in itself forms a comprehensive review of the origin, the growth, and application of Hindu civil law as a whole. This great work, though, as will be seen, not one for the general reader, forms a storehouse for the Oriental scholar and student of comparative history. Of the Rao Sahib's many contributions to the "Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society," and its Bombay Branch, of which he was (joint) honorary secretary during several years, one need not speak here, except to mention that several of these papers are reproduced in the present memorial volume. In the early seventies he rescued, republished, and edited, the transactions of "The Bombay Literary Society," containing a specially interesting account of the establishment of that body in 1804 by Sir James Mackintosh (then Recorder of Bombay) and the eminent men with whom that genial spirit was then surrounded.

His biographer remarks on, and, in some sort apologises for, the more conservative attitude which

in later years the Rao Sahib assumed towards social reform, and which, in its earlier stages, he heartily promoted. But as he believed to his very core in the divine authority of Hindunism, this change was inevitable; and, as Mr. Damodar puts it, "when the stranger, Mr. Malabari, began his crusade against Hindu marriage institutions . . . that alienation naturally grew into active opposition." It was rather from this feeling than from any slackening in political and patriotic spirit that he held back from the Congress movement, then early in its history; though his failing strength might well excuse him in this, if apology were needed for one who knew his own mind so well. As to that patriotic instinct which—with the religious reservation just alluded to—was the dominant factor of his career, it burned brightly to the last. Apart from indications of this already given in the review, no better illustration need be sought than the following passage from his speech on the occasion of the magnificent demonstration of India's gratitude to the Marquis of Ripon, at the farewell meeting in the Bombay Town Hall, November, 1884. In presenting the address, and after alluding to the numerous deputations which combined in its testimony, he said:

"This is not an age in which the gates of Somnath can make any Viceroy famous. We have gone beyond the heroic period. We have arrived at an age of commerce and electric communications. But what connects Lord Ripon with this meeting, and the whole of India, is that telegraphic influence which moves the human heart and the human mind, and which makes one feel as if all were united by a single voice—the voice that has brought us here to-day. The mental and moral influence which is the guiding and ruling spirit of the present administration commands our sympathies, our respect, our gratitude, and our affection."

The concluding paragraphs of the memoir, in which the tenderness as well as the strength of Vishvanath's character are sketched, comprise two or three pathetic touches—including references to his wife, a lady of true Marathi comeliness, an invalid during later years, though still young and fair, "his devotion to her never slackened"—indeed, as some of us remember, it became proverbial. The incidents at the moment of the Rao Sahib's decease are then mentioned. He had been unconscious for some hours, his medical attendants and near relatives had withdrawn to the verandah, when they were startled by a loud cry of "Rām, Rām!" They hastened to the couch, and found life was extinct: he

"had recovered consciousness just to cry out the name of his favourite god, as he always hoped he would be able to do . . . his final 'Rām, Rām' was the result of a determined will, which conquered even the physical prostration of body and brain."

Correspondence.

"THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS OF INDIA."

To the Editor of INDIA.

SIR,—As I have some claim to an opinion on the manner in which the conservancy of "the ancient monuments of India" is conducted by the responsible Government of that country, it may be of service in connexion with the question on the subject raised in the House of Commons by Sir William Wedderburn, if you will do me the favour of publishing in the

columns of INDIA the following letter, written in answer to an invitation addressed to me in 1894, to sign the petition referred to in Sir William Wedderburn's question, and presented to the Secretary of State for India on the 12th of July, 1894:—

"In reply to your letter of the 5th inst. inviting me to sign a memorial to the Secretary of State for India praying that adequate and systematic provision may be made for the guardianship of the historical monuments of India, I have, with the greatest respect, to state that it is impossible for me to honestly sign the said memorial; and for the reasons fully and frankly given to the gentlemen who some time ago came to ask me for information on which to base your memorial. I should have thought that the information I then supplied would have satisfied them that no memorial was necessary."

"The Government of India have for many years undertaken not only the systematic conservation, but the systematic exposition also, of the historical monuments of India, and the former work they have carried out in the most comprehensive, detailed, and thorough manner possible, and with *unqualified success*: so that now the most scrupulous guardianship is exercised not only over all the known historical monuments of India, but over innumerable pseudo monuments of no historical character, for the guardianship of which the Government of India should not, in my humble opinion, hold themselves responsible. I am fully possessed by the enthusiasm for art implied by your courteous and flattering appeal to me, and my interest in the architectural remains of India is a perennial source of delight to me—a recompense of heavenly price, as the Monk Theophilus says: 'retributionem celestis præmii': and passing them in review, as I write, I cannot in truth and gratitude but protest that I know of no Government that takes a more intelligent, zealous, and fruitful care of the historical monuments for which it should be held to be properly responsible than the Government of India."

"I could not therefore at any time sign the proposed memorial: whilst it is quite impossible for me to do so at a moment when the Government of India is under the weightiest obligation to the patient, long-suffering people of India to consider every possible means of financial retrenchment."

"I feel that my refusal may at first seem presumptuous, seeing, from your letter, that the memorial will be signed by three most eminent ex-Secretaries of State for India: but we all know how signatures are now-a-days given blindfold in support of any plausible appeal—i.e., 'accusation'—against Government: still I confess myself surprised that all these signatures are of 'My Lords.' Herodotus tells us that the Persians debated their 'burning questions' when drunk, and decided on them when sober. Tacitus tells us the same thing of the Germans, and Plato, I believe, of the Thracians. Sarmatians, Celts and Iberians. It seems, indeed, to have been a universal Aryan custom, and the germ of the division of our British Legislature into a House of Commons, or the nation drunk, and a House of Lords, or the nation sober. But what is the use of 'My Lords' if, instead of damping popular agitations, such as the present, they foment them by the enlarged imposture of their high sounding signatures?"

"But this is a playful digression, and, in closing my reply, I earnestly repeat that, in my clear conviction, the Government of India not only faithfully discharge their whole duty to the historical monuments of the country, but go far beyond it, having in recent years organised a special department for their exposition: work which I feel strongly is always better done by the private citizens of a nation than under the direction of the Supreme Committee of a nation called the State."

"The great day of Indian archaeological exposition was when it was left to the enthusiasm of independent scholars, and ever since it has been departmentalised it has languished."

"The only hope of reviving it is by returning to the old fashion of reliance on individual efforts, methodised, if you like, under the guidance of such learned bodies as the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, the Society of Biblical Archaeology, and the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies; by which last the noblest archaeological work of the rising generation of English scholars is being done. If the action of the societies you represent in the present connexion should result in some such scheme as this, it will not have been taken in vain."

The whole agitation is, in brief, as ignorant, hollow, and contemptible as could be, and the work of an irresponsible clique of the antiquarians, and the archaeologists, and the palaeologists, and the Royal Academicians "that are in all the realm." Sir William Wedderburn is of course in no ways implicated in their action; and his question in the House of Commons last Thursday night involves, as I understand it, no support of an unwarrantable, and absolutely inequitable charge on the already overburdened revenues of India.

I have etc.

(GEORGE BREDWOOD.)

18th May, 1897.

The following is the text of the "ignorant, hollow and contemptible" memorial referred to:—

Memorial to the Right Hon. Henry Hartley Fowler, M.P., H.M. Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

We beg respectfully to call your attention to a memorial presented twenty years ago to H.M. Principal Secretary of State for India in Council, by certain gentlemen interested in the history and antiquities of India, on the preservation of ancient buildings in that country.

We need not repeat what was then said as to the importance of these buildings both historically and archaeologically, and we gratefully acknowledge that much has been done since that time by the Government of India for the furtherance of the objects of the memorial; much, however, still remains to be done to meet the necessities of the case and to preserve the ancient buildings of India—unrivalled for their historic and artistic interest—from the frequent depredations of tropical rains; from the overpowering effects of jungle growth, and sometimes from destruction, by civil officers, railway contractors and others; and we venture to refer to the recommendations then made and apply them to the altered circumstances of the present day.

The first of the recommendations was for the classification of the different monuments in India on a defined system. That proposal the Government of India has carried out fully in the case of Bombay, the N.-W. Provinces and Oudh, while it is understood that similar valuable work is being prepared for Central India and the Central Provinces by Dr. Führer and Mr. Consens, who in the course of their investigations have brought to light fresh treasures of ancient art and ornament, and have made plain and intelligible much that before was unknown or obscure. The lists for the Provinces of Madras, Bengal, the Punjab and the States of Rajputana, are, however, still very defective, and we would suggest the extreme importance of completing them before it is too late, and causing detailed lists of the architectural remains to be compiled for each Province under the direction of an archaeological surveyor, similar to those drawn up by Dr. Führer for the N.-W. Provinces. Such volumes would be of the utmost value.

The second recommendation of the Memorial of 1873 was the employment of officers charged with the conservancy of historical monuments, whose business it would be not only to survey and catalogue the monuments most worthy of attention, but to visit them periodically, and to be responsible for the apportionment and expenditure of any grant made by Government for the purpose of keeping them in repair.

We would respectfully submit that this suggestion has not been carried out in the way intended. The execution of almost all repairs has, very naturally, been entrusted to the Public Works officers, but unfortunately, except in Bombay, the advice of the Superintendents of the Archaeological Surveys has not hitherto been systematically taken. The archaeological or architectural training, and the knowledge of the history, age and style of the buildings, which they possess, is necessarily of a more complete nature than can be expected from a Public Works engineer or Civil Officer.

The work requires much technical skill and experience, and for want of this, mistakes have been made and much injury unwittingly done to important monuments,¹ at the cost of

quite unnecessarily large expenditure. In some cases a building is restored at great expense and made completely solid and permanent, but unless the restorer understands the intention of the building, and possesses some little veneration for the art it displays, the result is almost always unsatisfactory, and any interest or value which it may originally have possessed is hopelessly destroyed. While in other cases the neglect of small and inexpensive repairs at the right moment has led to lamentable ruin.

† We would therefore recommend that no substantial interference with monumental remains of any kind, particularly by way of restoration, should be permitted except when the proposal has the full sanction of the Superintendent of Archaeological Survey (to be appointed), through whom Collectors, Public Works officers and others should in the first place report. He should also inspect and report on all conservation works carried on.

‡ The third suggestion of Memorial of 1873 was that a fixed sum should be annually allocated to the conservation of buildings. We venture to substitute for this a recommendation that each Government should be asked to assign in its Public Works budget a yearly sum for inspection and conservation of buildings, to be applied only after the Archaeological Surveyor has inspected the monuments, and checked or approved of the detailed estimates prepared under his instructions by the Public Works Department in each case. This would prevent injury and insure economy.

THE ROYAL ACADEMY OF ARTS.

(Signed) FREDERICK LEIGHTON, F.R.A.

THE SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES OF LONDON.

(Signed) A. W. FRANKS,

Pres. Soc. of Ant.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT BUILDINGS.

(Signed) { WM. MORRIS
J. H. MIDDLETON } *Hon. Secs.*
R. C. GROSVENOR } *S.T.A.B.*

THE ROYAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE.

(Signed) DILLON,

Pres. Royal Archaeol. Institute.

the brick superstructure—400 years old—was at once pulled down. Thus an old and interesting memorial of the end of the fifteenth century was summarily destroyed, without reference to the Archaeologist, who might at least have secured complete drawings of it, if, as a trained architect, he could not have devised some means of preserving it.

¶ We are informed that the sleeping apartments of the Great Akbar at Futtchpore Sikri form a distinct building in themselves. They possess various points of interest, amongst others a private doorway, which gave the Emperor access to his Record Office, and enabled his prime minister to visit him without public observation. An engineer was sent to Futtchpore Sikri to make some repairs, and for reasons best known to himself, built up this doorway. At the same time he built up openwork screens in another building, where blind screens had been before—and *vice versa*—and removed a staircase from one part of a palace to another for no sufficient reason.

¶ As an instance of such a catastrophe having been averted, we give the following:—In 1891 one of the domes of the Hummum at Futtchpore Sikri had a hole in it, about the size of a coconut. The ceiling of the dome is covered with exquisite designs in stamped plaster work unique of their kind, and if the hole had been allowed to remain until the monsoon, the rains would have washed through it, to the further ruin of the dome, and the plaster work and designs would have been for ever lost. ¶ There is no fund at the command of the Archaeological Surveyor for the repair and preservation of these buildings, and it is the duty of no one in particular to look after them. A note, however, from a stray traveller to the secretary of the department, who happened to be interested in archaeology, calling his attention to the condition of the Hummum, brought a workman to the spot, with a little plaster and a piece of zinc, and for the cost of a few rupees the dome was satisfactorily repaired and the delicate plaster work preserved.

† These recommendations do not apply to *urgent* and *non-structural* repairs such as in the case described in footnote (3).

¹ An illustrative case occurred not long since at Byganagar, where the collector, noticing that the base of the stone car, or "Rath," in front of the Vithal Temple showed cracks and signs of decay, reported it to the Government, and the Public Works engineer being instructed to deal with it, the whole of

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PARADE CHAMBERS, BOMBAY, S.W.]

VOL. VIII., No. 8.]
(NEW SERIES.)

AUGUST, 1897.

[Subscription, Post Free,
Six Shillings per Annum
in India, Six Shillings]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	225	The Poona Assassinations: A Case for Judicial Enquiry:	
Sir J. Westland's Financial Statement, 1897-98, by H. Morgan-Browne	232	I.—Joint Memorial of Hindus and Muham-	216
The Famine and the Finances of India, by W. M. J. Williams	234	madans	
Calcutta Municipal Corporation: Memorandum to the Secretary of State	236	II.—The "Full Reply" of the Bombay Go-	218
The Queen and Her Indian Subjects: Speech by Mr. Justice Ranade	239	vernment	
Wanted: A Judicial Enquiry	241	III.—The Attack on Professor Gokhale	249
That Blessed Word—"Privation"	243	IV.—Sir W. Wedderburn's Letters to the <i>Times</i>	249
Native Opinion and the Poona Outrage	244	V.—Reported Outrages on Native Women	250
		VI.—Letter from Pandita Ramabai	251
		VII.—The Native Press	252
		VIII.—Some Opinions of the Press	252

Indiana.

WHATEVER else may be doubtful in regard to the murder of Lieutenant Ayefst and Mr. Rand, one thing at least is certain—there must be a public and judicial enquiry. "We cannot see," wrote the *Unionist Observer* on July 4 with reference to the allegations contained in the Poona Memorial of May 10, "we cannot see what possible objection there can be to a public enquiry into the truth of these complaints: nay, more, we consider that it would be ill-advised and impolitic to shirk or refuse such an enquiry. It is precisely because the Government allow an impression to grow up that they will never permit any investigation into the conduct of their own servants, that discontent, thus forced beneath the surface, finds an outlet in the commission of crime. The laws and policy of government in India are worthy of the highest commendation and fit to stand as a model to the world. It is not in these that the fault lies, but in the way that the orders are interpreted by subordinate officers and their subordinates. . . . We feel certain that a frank and open invitation to those natives who have any grievances to allege to bring them forward for examination, so far from discrediting the authorities, high or low, would provide a much-needed means of ventilation, and a solid proof of the irreproachable and even-handed justice by which our administrative

acts are inspired." That, we take it, is the opinion to which the majority of thoughtful observers have come now that the heated feelings excited by the crimes have to some extent subsided. What is wanted, above all things, is to get at the truth. To the readers of newspapers in the United Kingdom the foul assassinations of June 22 came as a bolt from the blue. To very many persons in India it is evident that they appeared rather as the climax of a state of panic induced by a widespread belief that grievous wrongs were being done, and that no redress could be obtained. Opinions may differ as to the value of the evidence contained in the Poona Memorial, in Pandita Ramabai's letter, and in the signed complaints printed in such journals as the *Mahratta* and the *Dnyan Prakash* of Poona. But these and similar complaints obviously call for careful investigation. If the European soldiers who at Poona were charged with the difficult and delicate duties entrusted at Bombay to native agency are innocent of the offences attributed to them, by all means let their innocence be established. But if, whether wilfully or not, the domestic and religious susceptibilities of the inhabitants of Poona have been outraged, let the offence be proved, and let us not lightly attribute to political sedition crimes due to totally different causes. Lord G. Hamilton stated on July 1 that he had no reason to think that any enquiry "into the administration of Poona during the plague was necessary or desirable." We trust that he may yet see cause to change his opinion, if

indeed he has not already done so after the answer which he was compelled to give to Major Rasch in the House of Commons on July 26.

"Inspection" and "Examination." UNDER the heading, "Mr. Rand and the Deccan Sabha," the *Times of India* of April 24, printed this important letter:—

"The following is the answer received from Mr. Rand to the representation made by the Deccan and Anjuman Sabhas:

"N No. 684 of 1897.

"From Mr. W. C. Rand, I.C.S., Chairman, Plague Committee, Poona, to Rao Bahadur Vishnu Moreswar Bhide, Chairman, Deccan Sabha, Poona.

"Poona, 9th April, 1897.

"Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a letter, dated the 7th instant, from yourself and other gentlemen on the subject of certain matters connected with the plague operations in the city of Poona. The points raised in your letter have been considered by the Plague Committee.

"2. In view of the repugnance which, as you point out, is felt by certain classes of the community to the bringing of the female inmates of a house into the public street, it has been decided that for the future the female inmates of a house, to whatever community they belong, will not be sent into the street for inspection when they or the male members of their families object to this being done.

"3. Your remarks on the subject of the admission of native gentlemen to the General Plague Hospital appear to be made under a misapprehension of the rules in force, which allow of the admission of visitors under passes granted by the Inspecting Medical Officer. The rules relating to the General Plague Hospital so far as they concern the general public are in the press, and will be published shortly.

"4. I may inform you that it is the intention of the Committee that passes should be granted to representatives of all classes of the community, and they have full confidence that their intention will be given effect to by the Inspecting Medical Officer, Surgeon-Major Barry, to whom applications for passes should be made.—Yours, &c.,

"W. C. RAND.

"Chairman, Plague Committee, Poona."

With regard to the second paragraph of this letter, it will be seen from our Parliamentary report that on July 9 Lord George Hamilton laid stress upon the distinction between "inspection" and "examination," adding that Sir W. Wedderburn, on some occasion which is not named and is not apparent, had confused the two. According to the Government of Bombay, it appears that the practice which Mr. Rand promised to discontinue was merely the practice of taking women into some open place "that it might be seen whether they looked ill." This, we are assured, was a very different thing from "actual medical examination." The Government of Bombay is doubtless well-informed on this point. But it is to be noted that in the answer which Lord George Hamilton gave to Major Rasch on July 26, the official report speaks of immoral overtures to certain girls "in segregation huts at Khana plague inspection camp." Is it not a little odd to have a "camp"

where people might be taken merely "that it might be seen whether they looked ill"? This matter is, we cannot help thinking, one which is eminently suitable for impartial investigation.

"Soldiers and Plague Work." It is worth noting that the *Times of India*, writing in its issue of June 18 upon "Soldiers and Plague Work,"

says that the European soldiers employed at Poona "worked in all sorts of out of the way places, far from the cognizance of their officers."

Sir W. Wedderburn, as may be gathered from our Parliamentary report, sought to ask Lord George Hamilton on July 15, whether the statement contained in the *Times of India* was accurate. But the question, before it found its way to the Notice Paper, was somehow made to omit the reference to the *Times of India* and was therefore ridiculous. Sir W. Wedderburn accordingly stated that the question "had been so altered by the clerks at the Table that he did not propose to put it." The question, we understand, was mutilated on the ground that references to newspapers are not permitted—a reason which must seem a little odd to anybody familiar with the Notice Paper of the House of Commons, and which, during the past month for example, does not seem to have operated in the cases of Sir M. M. Bhownaggee (July 15), Major Rasch (July 26), and Sir W. Wedderburn himself (July 1).

In the first rush of excitement caused by the news of the Poona murders the Clamouring for the "Gag." less responsible organs of Tory opinion in London clamoured for restrictions upon the vernacular press in India. One hears less of this demand now, and, as will be seen from the newspaper extracts which we print elsewhere, the notion of "gagging" has been strongly condemned in all parts of the United Kingdom. On the other hand, Lord G. Hamilton has not yet retracted the words which he uttered, no doubt in the heat of the moment, on July 1: "The habitual dissemination of false intelligence and of appeals to religious animosities by a portion of the vernacular press is," he said, "a matter which has for some years past received the careful attention of the Indian Government; and if the result of the present enquiry is to show that this outrage was prompted by articles of this character, the question of taking measures to prevent the encouragement of crime through the press will undoubtedly be taken into consideration." By "the present enquiry" Lord G. Hamilton referred to a police enquiry into the causes and circumstances of the outrage. But when, on July 2, Sir W. Wedderburn asked him whether he intended to

propose press legislation for India as the result of a private enquiry, Lord G. Hamilton asserted that his words would not bear that interpretation. He added, in reply to Sir W. Harcourt, and amid loud Tory cheers, that it was the Indian Government which was responsible for the maintenance of law and order in India, and he protested against the "idea" that the House of Commons should have an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion upon the matter before a change was made in the press law of India. Anything more mischievous than a "Gagging" Act, it would be difficult to conceive. The authorities in India are not so well-informed as to the current of native opinion and sentiments that they can afford to extinguish such sources of information as they now possess. If Lord G. Hamilton proposes any such folly he will have the opinion of the best men in his own party against him. But these are not the men who cheer him to the echo in the House of Commons when he contradicts himself on successive days; and in the present temper of the House of Commons many things are possible. Lord G. Hamilton, however, would do well to consider the despatch which his colleague, the Duke of Devonshire (then Lord Hartington), forwarded to the Viceroy on January 28th, 1881, upon the expediency of repealing the Vernacular Press Act. The salient passages in that valuable document, which was followed by the repeal of a worse than useless measure, are as follows:—

"2. As your Excellency is aware, considerable doubts have from the first been entertained as to the expediency of the law in question, and it does not appear to me that there was any great weight of evidence for its necessity.

"3. While on the one hand it has provoked strong feelings of discontent and resentment, and is unquestionably open to the objection that it infringes the principle, which it is the object of the Government of India to uphold, of the equality before the law of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in India, on the other, there is but little reason to think that, as regards language inimical to British rule, the character of the vernacular press has since the passing of the Act undergone any essential change.

"4. I have nothing, therefore, before me to show that the original objections to the law of 1878 have been counter-balanced by increased security to Government, or other compensating advantages.

"5. Your Excellency is aware that the Vernacular Press Act applies not only to publications which are of a nature to excite disaffection and endanger the public peace, but also to those affecting private persons and public servants.

"6. As regards the latter object, I am of opinion that nothing short of the strongest evidence of a wide-spread system of extortion and intimidation, which the provisions of the Penal Code are inadequate to restrain, can justify such exceptional legislation. But if it proved to be indeed necessary, I should require special and peculiar reasons to satisfy me that, in any legislation on the subject, invidious exception should be permitted in favour of the English press.

"7. The defence of the Act in its application to seditious

writings is more plausible, but does not appear to be conclusive.

"8. I am aware that it has been represented by some whose views are deserving of the highest respect, that the criminal law of India applicable to seditious libel is practically unworkable, through the effect of the explanation appended to Section 124A of the Penal Code. If this be the case, I see no reason why the existing defect in the Code should not be remedied without recourse to such exceptional measures as those provided by the Act of 1878; and I would suggest, for the consideration of your Excellency in Council, whether, in the event of the repeal of the Act of 1878, it may not be desirable to propose suitable amendments in some of the provisions of the Penal Code relating to seditious and libellous writings.

"9. If, as I am disposed to infer, the Vernacular Press Act has been practically inoperative, whether such a result be due to the absence of seditious writings or to a reluctance on the part of the Government to exercise the invidious powers with which it invested them, the policy of its continuance may be considered apart from the question of any amendment of the Penal Code, especially as, in my opinion, the Act cannot be retained upon the statute book without being extended to the English press, and without some judicial check being interposed at some stage of the proceedings under it, upon the action of the executive Government.

"10. In any case, without desiring to fetter the discretion of your Excellency in Council as to the course which you may think it expedient to pursue on this important subject, I would invite your early consideration to the policy of the continuance of the Act of 1878. The question for your Excellency will be, not only whether repressive legislation of an exceptional kind should be maintained at the cost of much irritation, but also whether the Act has succeeded in securing the avowed object with which it was passed."

It is not easy to make out either the facts or the precise meaning of the unfortunate rioting at Chitpur. Even

the ostensible bone of contention cannot, it would seem, be reported to this country with complete certainty. It seems that a piece of land had been taken possession of by a Hindu under an order of Court, and that certain Muhammadans offered opposition on the ground that the land contained a mosque. Reuter's correspondent says that "a mud hut at Entalla, which no respectable Muhammadan would claim to be a mosque, was demolished under police protection." The question of respectability is a matter of taste or opinion. But whether or not the hut was a mosque seems an odd point of doubt. In any case, it is plain enough that an order of Court must be obeyed, and that, if it be not obeyed, it must be enforced by the police, or, if need be, by the military power of the State. The one fact that is not doubtful in the matter is that keen feeling was widely aroused among the Muhammadan population. A policy of "divide and rule" tends to produce its own nemesis, and if it be the case that the Indian Muhammadans or some of them have inferred—wrongly, of course—from the conduct of responsible officers that for a Muham-

madan all things are lawful, some degree of contumacy is not difficult to explain. The sequence of events may be briefly indicated. On Monday, the police enforce possession. On Tuesday, 2,000 Muhammadans assemble to rebuild the dismantled "mosque." On Wednesday, the Entalla pumping station is attacked; the telephone wires are cut; "the rioters meanwhile indulge in fierce war cries, mingled with vile epithets and threats"; "many women are grossly insulted, a few being even subjected to violence." "For over 48 hours one-third of the town was in the hands of some 5,000 determined anti-European rioters." "One party of native police was surrounded by rioters, and all of them, to the number of 24, were seriously injured." "Scattered gangs infested the streets, hooting and stoning Europeans." The official report says "no shots were fired by the military." It does not say whether the police fired, but it admits "eight rioters reported killed and many wounded," while Reuter's correspondent says, "a low estimate places the number killed at 600." The discrepancies are sufficiently amazing. But the rioting was evidently "of a serious character," and naturally created "a good deal of uneasiness."

There is a great deal too much Simla, undoubtedly, but one is not inclined to suppose that the outbreak would have taken a substantially different course if all Simla had been in Calcutta at the time. There was no lack of authority to deal with the disturbance. If the facts were somewhere between the official and the private report, the chief ground of blame would seem to lie in the prolongation of the trouble. The law ought to be enforced with promptitude and decision. It is preposterous that one-third of a town should be in the hands of 5,000 determined rioters for over 48 hours, and the military stand by and see the police mauled and "seriously injured" without firing a shot. In any case, the riot was too bad to be temporised with for a moment. Whatever be the true view of the administrative procedure, it is very justly "regarded as somewhat significant that the Hindus passively sympathised with the Muhammadan rioters"; and this significance is emphasised by the opinion of the native Press "that better-planned disturbances, or one more under the control of the leaders, were never known," as well as by the foolish vernacular "jubilation on the loss of respect for Europeans." We remark elsewhere on this ominous coalition of Hindu and Muhammadan sympathy of antagonism to Europeans and to the Government. It is perfectly within the power of the Government to break it up and disarm it before any substantial mischief comes of it, though one

acknowledges a feeling of hopelessness of any statesmanlike remedy in that quarter. The leaders, we take it, will be dealt with promptly and effectively, as the law directs. That, however, is merely in settlement of the present business. What we are specially concerned for is the general situation: the reasonable conciliation of just grievances, so as to remove the combustible materials that have been allowed to accumulate, and to prevent the generation of more. It is an elementary demand on statesmanship, and it is enforced materially by the obvious significance of recent events in various widely separated parts of the Indian peninsula.

Wanted: A Village Enquiry. ONCE more the debate in the House of Commons on the Indian Budget is to be taken at the fag-end of the Session, in spite of the number and the importance of the subjects which call for discussion. The handful of members who strive to do their duty by India will once more, it seems, have to address a listless and almost empty House. But they are not to be discouraged, and, in view of the approaching debate, Sir W. Wedderburn has issued to all members of the House of Commons a pamphlet containing the articles lately contributed by him to our columns upon the famine. In a brief introductory note the Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee writes:—

"At the approaching Indian Budget, upon the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair, I propose to move the following amendment, 'That looking to the grievous sufferings endured by the people of India during the present year, this House is of opinion that a detailed and searching village enquiry should be instituted, in order to ascertain the causes which blight the industry of the cultivators, and render them helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine and pestilence.' I asked for this enquiry last January, as an Amendment to the Address; pointing out that the rural villages include 80 per cent. of the population, that the village community is the microcosm of all India, and that if means could be discovered to make one village prosperous a clue would be obtained to make all India prosperous. I further pointed out that no Imperial Commission was required, no one need be sent out from England, no one need be withdrawn from famine duty, and no cost worth mentioning need be incurred. In each Province the local administration should select typical villages, and appoint a representative Committee of experienced men, official and non-official, European and Indian, to make a thorough, impartial, and fearless diagnosis of their condition, the investigation to be of a microscopic kind to detect the microbes which blight the rayat's industry. The rayat is a small and humble person. He does not want any heroic action, but patient and detailed enquiry into his grievances, and remedies suited to his condition. I indicated briefly in my speech the nature of the grievances, and the nature of the remedies desired.

"Unfortunately this prayer for enquiry has (partly perhaps from a misapprehension as to its scope) been refused by Lord G. Hamilton; and I have been thus driven to lay before the House and the public some facts showing how the rayat has been brought to ruin. In the four articles herewith reproduced

from India, I have detailed a few of the more prominent evils which afflict him, evils which have been officially admitted for the last thirty or forty years; and I claim to have proved (1) that these evils are the direct result of ill-advised and revolutionary changes introduced by our government, and (2) that when the proper remedies are pointed out the administration will neither apply them itself, nor permit others to do so. On the contrary, when, after years of patient labour, practical schemes have been matured for improving the condition of the rayat, such movements have been crushed by the authorities, even when (as in one case) the scheme had received the hearty approval and support of the Viceroy in Council. I challenge the authorities to deny any one of the statements upon which these conclusions are based. To any candid mind the wonder is, not that the people are in a state of economic collapse, but that they are able to exist at all. All these evils are quite unnecessary. With a rich soil, a fine climate, and peasantry skilful, industrious and frugal, India, if she gets fair play, ought to be a garden, not a place of desolation.

"By the kindness of the proprietors of the *Graphic* I am enabled, by way of frontispiece, to show the condition of the miserable beings for whom I plead. The unfortunate people of India have this year been suffering from almost every calamity to which a nation can be subjected. Their minds are distracted and they are almost driven to despair. How can any one find in his heart to regard them with anger, and advocate measures of harshness and rigour? Of all races in the world the Indians are the most gentle, the most docile, the most law-abiding; the easiest to govern, and the most grateful for kindness. Is there a talk of disaffection abroad? I say that if we are unable to gain the affection of such a race, we show ourselves unfit to be a ruling power. The first step towards gaining their affection is to make patient and careful enquiry into their grievances, and do our best to redress them.

The pamphlet is entitled "The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast," and the frontispiece is a photograph of a group of famine-stricken Indian peasants.

"OTHER Finance Ministers when they present their statements have to defend the expenditure proposed against the representatives of the taxpayer. Here the position is exactly the reverse; the Finance Minister is the solitary representative of the taxpayers of India." Even to ears accustomed to the anomalies of Indian Government, Sir James Westland's pithy statement of his own remarkable position is sufficiently startling. Could one imagine Mr. Goschen uttering a similar sentence with reference to his relations with the taxpayers of England one might grasp in some measure the incongruity of our management of Indian finance with our national and hereditary notions of popular government. If Sir Henry Fowler's famous declaration that every member of the House of Commons is a member for India had been more than an ornament of a showy peroration, the debate on the Indian Budget in the Commons might compensate for the deficiencies of the discussion in the Viceroy's Council. To-day when, in spite of famine, plague, earthquake, and war, India has tried to join in the general rejoicing of the

Empire, surely her plight might arouse the sympathy and attract the attention of the House. If the opportunity provided for the discussion of India's many troubles by the introduction of the Budget is allowed this year to slip by in the ordinary way—and there is every sign that it will—even the most sanguine supporter of Indian reforms may be excused for feeling that short of a terrible disaster nothing can overcome the apathy of Parliament in all that concerns the welfare of "our greatest dependency."

A NOTEWORTHY contribution to the discussion in the Viceroy's Council was made by Mr. Sayani. His treatment

of the question of Provincial Contracts was discussed in our last issue. Referring to irrigation he called attention to the necessity of an enquiry into the causes of the comparative failure of some of the greater works. The tendency of late years is rather to press on railway construction than irrigation, even in districts where irrigation is likely to be profitable. The Hon. Rao Sahab Balwant Rao Bhuskute presented an interesting table showing that the unprofitableness of many of the works is due to excessive cost of maintenance, which, in some cases, equals annually the amount of the first cost, and in most cases exceeds 50 per cent. of the first cost. When, in spite of this, irrigation works pay 5 per cent. all round it seems odd to suspend them in favour of railway construction when money is scarce. The remark of the Famine Commission that "cultivators and landlords do something towards the improvement of their land" by sinking wells and so on, might be much truer if cultivators were not hopelessly fettered by debt. The remedy is indicated by Mr. Sayani. "Government will do well to devise some measure by which agricultural indebtedness may be gradually diminished and ultimately cease to exist. And in this connexion I will humbly urge that suitable agricultural banks may be established and a permanent settlement, with assessment in kind on a sliding scale, may be substituted in lieu of the present rigid system of payment in cash." Another important measure for the increase of production and the redistribution of population within the limits of India was urged by Mr. Playfair and the Mahārāja of Darbhanga. The typical case chosen was Assam, with its 21,000 square miles of "soil of the richest description" and its "scanty population of 2½ millions, importing instead of producing and exporting supplies of food." The plan suggested by the Mahārāja of selling tracts of land to syndicates and capitalists has received the approval of Sir William Hunter, and deserves the attention of the Government.

THE INDIAN DEBT. MORE technical and general remedies for the financial difficulties of the provinces were urged by Mr. Sayani and other Indian members of the Council. Mr. James, whose somewhat flippant speech received a well-merited rebuke from Sir Alexander Mackenzie, drew from the comparatively satisfactory condition of Bengal merely the inference that Bengal should be more heavily taxed to meet the deficiencies caused by ill-regulated taxes in the other provinces. It is hardly necessary to controvert so perverse a proposition. The obvious retort is that the Government would do well to follow the precedent established in Bengal and institute something like a permanent settlement of the land revenue. It is more necessary to reduce the contributions of the other presidencies than to increase the contribution of Bengal. An effort, too, is urgently needed to control the growth and provide for the extinction of the Indian debt. Mr. Stevens called attention to the entire absence of any sinking fund, if we except the Famine Insurance Fund, on which it is superfluous to dwell at this period. Meanwhile the increase of the debt steadily proceeds, and the least satisfactory feature of this increase is the disproportion between rupee and sterling debt. The Hon. Rao Bhuskute directed attention to the unwisdom of this course.

"In 1893 our rupee debt amounted to 102 crores, and our sterling obligations exceeded 106½ million pounds. The corresponding figures in 1896-7 were 107 crores of rupee debt and 116 millions of sterling obligation. The sterling loans, though nominally bearing as low a rate of interest as 2½ and 3 per cent., really represent, by reason of adverse exchange, a charge equivalent to 6 to 7 crores of rupees, while the charge on the rupee debt has been sensibly reduced by the recent conversions from 4 to 3½ per cent., and 3½ to 3 per cent. . . . Of course to meet the Home Charges there is a certain convenience in the Secretary of State's borrowing sterling loans in England. But this convenience is only temporary, while the risks are far more permanent and burdensome."

Such an opportunity of economic reform no English Chancellor of the Exchequer who valued his reputation would dare to lose. Certainly his political opponents would not let slip the chance for damaging criticism. The responsible criticism of elected representatives would prove the salvation of Indian finance.

MILITARY EXPENDITURE. A DEBATE on Indian finance without discussion of military policy would indeed resemble "Hamlet" shorn of the title-rôle. The native members are fully alive to the prime importance of the military factor, and the Commander-in-Chief himself makes some significant admissions with respect to the sharing of expenses between England and India. Mr. Sayani referred to the "costly foreign agency, the con-

sequent large annual drains from this country, Imperial military policy with its scientific frontiers and constant border wars." Mr. Ananda Charlu again emphasized his point of last year. "Within these ten years the forward policy alone has cost us, apart from the wars themselves, an aggregate sum of nearly seventy crores, and has added to our permanent expenditure no less a sum than six crores per annum." The admissions of Sir G. S. White are of the utmost significance:—

"We maintain that the Indian army does supply a great addition of military power to England, that a large part of the British army is trained at the expense of India, and that the whole of the men passed into the Reserve from India have been maintained out of Indian revenues. . . . The expenditure charged by England should be limited, not by arithmetical details, but by statesmanlike and broad appreciation of the conditions of the two countries."

The Commander-in-Chief rightly scouted the idea that India should be asked to pay a contribution towards the fleet which is optional in the case of our wealthy colonies, and would vote the reduction of the subsidy. He agrees with Mr. Sayani in hoping for much from Lord Welby's Commission, but the refusal of that Commission to discuss questions of policy makes us less sanguine. It is somewhat disappointing, after reading such honest and common-sense opinions, to find Sir G. S. White advocating the extension of British influence on the frontier, and to find him capable of the usual cant about the extension of that influence being in the best interests of humanity. That point one would willingly waive in the firm belief that if the House of Commons would do its duty and assume the responsibility for such expenditure as, being really Imperial, is imposed on Indian taxpayers, the forward policy would not survive a single Session.

A CORRESPONDENT writes: The details of the attack on a British force in the Tochi Incident." Tochi Valley afford a curious confirmation of the contentions of Colonel Hanna and other opponents of the Forward Policy. The dangers of the present system have been pointed out repeatedly, and yet in spite of numerous warnings based on past experience the plan of half-trusting half-coercing the border tribes continues. The Chitral incident is being repeated on a smaller scale. A political officer has been attacked while he was choosing a site for an outpost and attempting to collect a fine for past misconduct. Whether the fine was a just one, or the policy of menace implied in the choosing of sites for outposts a wise one, are questions which do not apparently enter into the calculations of the authorities. A number of valuable lives have been thrown away, and further waste of life will follow. For no one can doubt that the wild tribesmen will offer a

stubborn resistance to the advance of the punitive force, which in due accord with precedent has been sent forward. Telegrams from Datta-Khel inform us that four or five men succeeded in getting into the camp by night and again made good their escape, while the tribal marksmen are making exceedingly good practice at the sentries. A not unnatural inference is that there are amongst the enemy men with accurate knowledge of the arrangements of a British camp, and arms of great precision probably manufactured for the British Government. The suicidal nature of the policy of training tribal levies in British discipline while the insidious advance on the frontier continues has been frequently emphasized. All the indications point to a realization in Tochi of the prophecies made in this connexion. Our intelligence shows that the tribesmen have not lost at any rate their command of the style of warfare which, if the writers of letters to the *Times* may be believed, proved so demoralizing to the Kandahar force in the last Afghan war.

THE unanimity with which the course taken by the Indian Government in extinguishing Jhalawar as a separate State has been condemned by the Indian press is worthy of note. The Allahabad *Pioneer* is, of course, excepted from the general chorus of disapproval, seeing that it could do no other than follow its implied obligation as expositor of the Political Department. The official journal's pleas on behalf of this arbitrary vivisection of a State which, as with the rest, had its political entity guaranteed by the British Government, were promptly met by both the Bombay dailies, notably by the *Times of India* (May 28 and June 26). These pleas mainly proceeded on the flimsy ground of economising administrative expenditure by amalgamation, and of convenience in "scientific" adjustment of boundaries. To this it is replied that quite different views of these matters will be taken alike by the people and the ruling classes of Jhalawar, while artificial symmetry will be a doubtful gain at the expense of extinguishing the local patriotism and individuality of the little State. Above all, it is pointed out that this new and insidious method of annexation—though not to British territory, and without even the sinister excuse of "lapse"—tends to unsettle the accepted position of Indian States, is a flagrant breach of Treaty rights, and does despite to that pacifying and conservative policy of Canning which was grandly confirmed by Her Majesty's golden Proclamation of 1858. It is in this light that the arbitrary extinction of Jhalawar and gratuitous aggrandisement of Kotah presents a grave and disturbing aspect. Let it be noted that this political

transaction has been carried through by a secret and irresponsible bureau, without so much as a reference to the High Court of Parliament or to the Queen in Council. And though, as stated in the official "Order," it has been "approved by the Secretary of State," that scarcely carries the process a step further; for he is only an executive officer without juridical responsibility or any true sovereign authority. This is mere bastard imperialism; and if there were any really live constitutional lawyers amongst us its exercise would be sharply challenged. In a very practical sense this episode in kingdom-making raises once more the unanswered question, "By whom is India governed?" It is also an illustration, from the inside, of the daring encroachments of the Political Department, alike at Simla and Westminster, which have already wrought such havoc on the territorial integrity and financial condition of our Indian Empire. Hence it is with some sense of relief that, notwithstanding distractions all round, the Indian press—Anglo-Indian journals included—have raised timely and intelligent protest in this typical instance.

THE condition of the Elavas, a low caste in Travancore, seems (writes an Indian correspondent) to be deplorable.

In answer to a question asked in the House of Commons on July 19, whether the Elavas are excluded from all appointments in the State of Travancore on the ground that they belong to a low caste, the Secretary of State for India replied that he had no precise information. But the information placed at my disposal goes to show that there is no Elava in the service of the Government of Travancore receiving even such a small salary as Rs. 10 *per mensem*, though the Elavas form 22.05 per cent. of the Hindu and 16.12 per cent. of the total population in the State. The compiler of the Travancore Census Report of 1881, himself a distinguished official in the service of the State, speaks of them as a "most numerous and industrious class," and an "able-bodied and hard-working race." They contribute largely to the revenue of the State, and there are many educated men among them—some of them graduates of Madras University. In June last year one of these graduates applied to the Travancore High Court for an appointment in the judicial branch of the administration, and received the following reply from the registrar:

"With reference to his application, dated the 27th ultimo, — is informed that the traditional State policy is against his employment, and that he should apply to Government."

The applicant protested against this absurd "traditional State policy," and appealed to the Dewan, or Prime Minister, but the only reply was:

"The petitioner may apply for employment in the D.P.W."

Forest Department or any other like departments where it may be possible to entertain men of his class."

The Secretary of State says that there are "9,517 Elava boys and 1,368 Elava girls" under instruction. The reply is not to the point. It is notorious that only a few schools are open to Elavas in Travancore and that many poor boys are prevented from receiving any education as the Government schools near their homes are closed to them. In February 1891, in reply to a petition from some members of the Elava Community, the superintendent of district schools stated:

"The undersigned regrets that children of their community cannot for the present be admitted to the Government English school at——."

Again, in April, 1895, another petitioner was told by the inspector of schools

"that he cannot be admitted to the —— English school, as the people there object to have one of his class admitted in the school."

Popular objection is a myth encouraged by Government officials. It is surprising that in a native state like Travancore, ruled as it is by an enlightened sovereign, such restrictions should be placed on any community.

SIR J. WESTLAND'S FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1897-98.

By H. MORGAN-BROWNE.

Sir James Westland concludes his summary of the principal features of his Budget Statement with these words:—"The Government of India are for the time in serious financial difficulties caused by the famine. When that calamity and the plague in Bombay and Sindh shall have passed away the Government will, it is hoped, be found to be in a strong financial position." The question is how far is this hope justified? Is the Government of India, apart from the exigencies of the present famine, in a strong financial position? I propose briefly to examine in the light of the official figures this claim of the Indian Finance Minister, which is none the less a claim to financial rectitude because expressed in phrases of judicious hope.

In order to appreciate the present position and future prospects of Indian Government finance it is necessary to make some comparison with a recent past. So progressive and so rapid is the increase of Indian Civil and Military Expenditure that almost any past year will serve as a date of departure for such comparison, inasmuch as it will provide sufficient contrast to enable the mind to detect clearly the trend of Indian finance. I have taken the year 1894-95 as possessing one or two advantages which seem to make it a convenient starting point. In the first place it relates to a time only three years ago, and therefore can hardly be considered an unfair standard to set up so far as the Government of India is concerned; and in the second place Exchange

was lower during that year than it has ever been before or since, consequently the Government cannot plead an increasing burden of Exchange during the last three years to account for any growth of expenditure which an examination of the figures may bring to light.

The following tables, then, show the changes in Indian Revenues and Expenditure in the Budget estimate for the current year, 1897-98, as compared with the closed accounts for 1894-95. The figures here given include exchange in every form, as it has been explained that such inclusion cannot operate in detriment of the Government's claims to sound and economical administration, but tends rather to hide the real growth of expenditure which has taken place. The figures are net in all cases, and are taken, for 1894-5 from tables in a return of net Income and Expenditure to the House of Commons (No. 127 of 1896) dated India Office, 26 March, 1896; and for 1897-8 from similar tables at pp. 80, 81 of the Indian Financial Statement, a Parliamentary Return (No. 193 of 1897), and dated India Office, 3 May, 1897.

FINANCES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

I.—NET INCOME.

	1894-5 (Accounts). Rx.	1897-8 (Budget). Rx.	Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) Rx.
I. Land Revenue, etc.:			
i. Land Revenue ..	25,358,400	25,601,800	+ 243,400
ii. Forest	1,623,200	1,753,000	+ 129,800
iii. Tributes	770,200	901,600	+ 122,400
TOTAL LAND, etc. ..	27,750,800	28,256,400	+ 495,600
II. Opium	5,702,600	3,156,200	— 2,546,400
III. Taxation:			
i. Salt	8,628,900	8,608,800	+ 63,900
ii. Stamps	4,568,500	4,782,600	+ 214,100
iii. Excise	5,500,400	5,653,800	+ 153,400
iv. Provincial Rates ..	3,535,600	3,616,000	+ 80,400
v. Customs	3,774,900	4,375,900	+ 601,000
vi. Assessed Taxes ..	1,794,700	1,836,800	+ 42,100
vii. Registration	417,000	439,760	+ 22,760
TOTAL TAXES	28,220,000	29,403,600	+ 1,183,600
IV. Miscellaneous ..	470,800	366,800	— 104,000
TOTAL REVENUE	62,154,200	61,183,000	— 971,200

Before passing to Expenditure there are one or two points to note with reference to the above table. The Land Revenue proper (I i) for 1897-8, although showing an increase of nearly Rx. 250,000, is less by about Rx. 500,000 than it would otherwise be on account of the famine. The year which has just closed showed a deficiency of about Rx. 2,500,000 under this head. The chief receipts from Land Revenue are from January—March. The increase of Rx. 600,000 in Customs includes an increase of about Rx. 500,000 due to the modified Cotton Duties recently imposed. Very noteworthy is the loss of Revenue on opium. This source of revenue is notoriously fluctuating, still it is startling to find that only five years ago, in 1892-3, the net receipts were Rx. 6,381,000, more than double the estimated net receipts for the current year. This decrease is in all probability transient, as dependent not on policy

but on the character of the seasons and the course of trade. Under taxation the estimated loss due to the famine may be put at about Rx.250,000. On the Revenue side of the account, therefore, the position may be considered fairly strong. In three years there has been an increase of nearly Rx.1,700,000 under land and taxation, which, but for the famine, might have been nearly Rx.2,500,000. The only set-off to this is the fact that half-a-million of it is due to increased taxation (*i.e.*, the Cotton Duties), and the severe but temporary shrinkage of the opium revenue. It is quite possible, should the famine not extend over the current year and should the foreign demand for Indian opium revive, that in 1898-9 the Revenue should be about Rx.2,000,000 larger than it was in 1894-5.

FINANCES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

II.—NET EXPENDITURE.

	1894-5 (Accounts). Rx.	1897-8 (Budget). Rx.	Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue:			
i. Land	4,048,100	4,166,700	+118,600
ii. Forest	913,400	1,076,100	+162,700
iii. Other Heads	1,357,600	1,474,900	+117,400
iv. Assignments	1,501,300	1,553,300	+52,000
TOTAL	7,820,300	8,271,000	+450,700
II. Debt Services	4,309,000	2,708,700	—1,600,300
III. Civil Services:			
i. Departments	13,206,200	13,778,600	+572,400
ii. Miscellaneous Charges	5,326,300	5,242,400	—83,900
iii. Works	3,712,000	3,919,300	+207,300
TOTAL	22,244,500	22,940,300	+695,800
IV. Military Services:			
i. Army	23,085,900	23,314,200	+228,300
ii. Military Works	948,300	1,181,200	+232,900
iii. Special Defence	217,900	19,400	—198,500
TOTAL	24,252,100	24,514,800	+262,700
V. Commercial Services:			
Total Net Cost	2,766,200	2,728,700	—37,500
VI. Famine Relief	610,200	3,666,200	+3,056,000
VII. Railway Con- struction.. }	19,600	7,300	—12,300
TOTAL EXPENDITURE..	62,021,900	64,837,000	+2,815,100

The main features of the progress of expenditure may be summarised as follows:—

	Rx.
Increase in Civil and Military Ex- penditure (I, III, and IV) ..	+1,409,200
Decrease in other Expenditure (II, V, and VII)	—1,650,100
Cost of Famine Relief	+3,056,000
Total Net Increase	+2,815,100

But these figures conceal far more than they reveal of the true state of the case. For the last three years Exchange has been rising, with the result that the Government of India have received from this source a gift of no less than Rx.3,082,700

in reduction of expenditure, made up as shown in the following table:—

	1894-5 (Accounts). Rx.	1897-8 (Budget). Rx.	Decrease of Burdens in 1897-8 Rx.
Shown in Exchange			
Column	12,899,100	10,504,200	—2,394,900
Sterling Pay of British Troops	1,134,300	+777,200	—357,100
Exchange Compensation	*1,236,000	+836,300	—397,700
	15,269,400	12,119,700	—3,149,700
Profit on Remittance Transactions	—227,000	—160,000	+67,000
NET TOTAL	15,042,400	11,959,700	—3,082,700

This three millions has to be distributed over the various heads of expenditure; but, without unnecessary detail, it may be allocated as to Rx.1,100,000 to the Railway Account, as to Rx.400,000 to the Debt Services, and as to the balance, say, Rx.1,582,700 to Civil and Military Expenditure. This will give the true state of the account as follows:—

INCREASE OF EXPENDITURE. (Excluding Exchange.)

	Rx.	Rx.
Increase in Civil and Military Expenditure (I, III, and IV)	1,409,200	
Add for reduction in cost of Exchange, say	1,582,700	
True increase in Civil and Military Expenditure, say	2,991,900	
Decrease in other Expen- diture (II, V, and VII) ..	—1,650,100	
Less savings effected by lower Exchange, say ..	+1,500,000	
True decrease in other expenditure, say, ..	—150,100	
Cost of Famine Relief	3,056,000	
True Net Total Increase of Ex- penditure	Rx. 5,897,800	

Therefore, making allowance for the cost of the Famine, there would be but for the fortune of a lower exchange an addition of Rx.3,000,000 in Civil and Military Expenditure, whereas under the most favourable conditions there could only be an increase of Rx.2,000,000 in the Revenues to meet it, while a quarter of this increase is due to additional taxation and *pro tanto* represents a further weakening of the financial position. Under these circumstances it would not seem reasonable to contend that on the expenditure side of the amount, the financial position is anything but deplorably weak. The matter may be put most strikingly in this way. So far as expenditure is concerned, the improvement in exchange since 1894-5 will pay for the cost of the famine in 1897-8, as it has practically done in 1896-7, and as a similar but smaller improvement

* Revised Estimate, 1894-5.

† See para. 47 of Indian Financial Statement, 1897 (Parl. Return).

‡ See para. 161 of Indian Financial Statement, 1897 (Parl. Return).

paid for the cost of the Ohitral expedition in 1895-6. In these three years Exchange, formerly the bugbear, has become the stand-by of Indian Finance. It is only fair to Sir James Westland to say that when exchange was falling he was minute and explicit, loud and tabular in his complaint against the evil thing, but that now that Exchange is rising and that the evil has become a good and a godsend, he does not unduly advertise the fact. He recognizes that the public are tired of hearing about Exchange, and for the present at any rate shares their feelings. Here, however, it must be pointed out with all necessary insistence that if no blame attaches for the cost of the famine no credit belongs for the millions set free by Exchange, and that the evil and the good exactly balance each other on the expenditure side.

There remains that addition of three crores to civil and military expenditure (excluding Exchange) in three years—a million a year. Now every allowance may be made for the loss of revenue due to the famine, to the sudden if temporary loss of Opium Revenue, but that three crores remains a striking witness to the fact that however disastrous the times, be it through a fall in exchange or be it through a widespread famine, Indian Civil and Military expenditure continues to increase faster than the revenues, even when aided from time to time by fresh taxation. No amount of explanation and excuse can absolve the Government of India from the charge of persistently living beyond its normal and regular income.

The evidence of financial weakness disclosed by these figures is further emphasized by a consideration of the balancing of the account. During the three years there has been a change from a surplus of Rx.693,100 to a deficit of Rx.2,464,000, or a deterioration of Rx.3,157,100, *although the cost of the famine has been almost covered by a diminished cost of Exchange*. Nor is this all. Even in 1894-5 the surplus was largely fictitious, as the provincial governments had been obliged to meet more than half a million of expenditure by reducing their balances—this means that whatever the Imperial Government was doing, the Provincial Governments were living beyond their incomes. But in 1897-8, this mischievous expedient is carried further; the provincial balances are to be reduced by Rx.1,190,000 during the year. Apart from this "provincial adjustment," to give it its technical name, the real change in the financial position is from a surplus of Rx.132,300 to a deficit of Rx.3,654,000 or a deterioration of over three and three-quarter millions.

FINANCES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

III. SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.

	1894-5 (Accounts). Rx.	1897-8 (Budget). Rx.	Better (+) or Worse (-). Rx.
Net Revenue	62,154,200	61,183,000	-971,200
Net Expenditure	61,021,900	64,837,000	-2,815,100
Surplus (+) or Deficit (-)	+132,300	-3,654,000	-3,786,300
Add: Drawings from Provincial Balances }	560,800	1,190,000	
Net Surplus (+) or Deficit (-)	+693,100	-2,464,000	-3,157,100

The fact, however, which overshadows all others is this: That in years of financial stress and calamitous famine Indian civil and military expenditure (excluding exchange) increases at the average rate of a crore of rupees a year, outstripping as it has done these last twelve years both the natural increase in the revenues and the additions due to fresh taxation. Explanations matter nothing. No sane man charges the Indian Government with dishonesty or with reckless extravagance. But making every possible allowance for misfortune and accepting as fact every allegation of usefulness in the growing expenditure, it is impossible to believe that there is any real strength in the Indian financial position, or that a constant tendency to live beyond one's means can be fraught with anything but grave peril for a government persisting in such a course.

THE FAMINE AND THE FINANCES OF INDIA.

By W. M. J. WILLIAMS.

The Famine, the Plague, and the Earthquake—these have been three all-sufficient reasons why India could not jubilate this year. These, however, seem to be quite insufficient to make Indian officials depart from their habit of writing as though most things were *coulour de rose*. True the famine appears prominently in the Financial Statement recently placed before the Government by Sir James Westland, but a buoyant tone pervades the whole, and this is even detected in the figures submitted to the whole world. Yet the famine figures published as late as July 14 last, nearly four months later than the presentation of the Financial Statement to the Viceroy in Council, are of a most serious aspect. Bombay, at this last report, had on *gratuitous* relief, in addition to the great crowds on relief works, as many as 45,565: Madras, 136,714; Bengal, 403,999; N.-W. Provinces, 406,977; Punjab, 11,404; Central Provinces, 110,683; Burma, 1,314; and Berar, 6,659.

"Including Native States (says the report) numbers on relief 3,303,968 against 4,240,337 last month. Up to June 25th ordinary monsoon conditions appeared well established. Agricultural operations had generally commenced and numbers on relief were declining. West coast monsoon then died away, and, excepting scattered showers, weather throughout the country has been fine. Burma still receives good rain. Good rain is now falling again on west coast to the south of Bombay and in Mysore, and fair rain has fallen last three days throughout Central Provinces and parts Bengal and N.-W. Provinces. Bombay, Deccan, and Madras still without rain. If there is renewed advance of the monsoon now damage will not have been very great, but present situation serious in districts where sowings on large scale have been made. Elsewhere sowing operations suspended and persons returning to relief works. Great scarcity of fodder felt in Bombay, Madras, Haidarabad, Berar, and parts of Central Provinces. Prices are rising, but not rapidly . . . grain supplies sufficient generally for three months, except Betal, Bhandara, and other isolated tracts in Central Provinces and elsewhere."

However gratifying it is to perceive any—the slightest—improvement, it is obvious that the position is still one of the gravest anxiety. All over the country some alleviations are known, but all over the country also, as the above figures show, great crowds are being kept and fed at the public expense. The

anxiety about the monsoon, which the above telegram shows, will have been in great part relieved since, for have we not heard of the rains and plentiful rains? For our present purpose, however, it is sufficient to notice the fact that the Financial Statement had been submitted before this relief could have been foreseen, when it was only the desire of hard-driven officials.

The following is the official summary of the current cycle of accounts of Revenue and Expenditure.

THE ACCOUNTS OF 1895-6.

Revenue—		Revised Estimates.	Accounts.
India	Rx.	97,509,000	97,977,005
England	£	210,300	223,417
Exchange	Rx.	158,600	169,745
TOTAL ..	Rx.	97,877,900	98,370,167
Expenditure—			
India—Imperial, Provincial and Local.	Rx.	69,003,000	68,998,722
Adjustments of Provincial and Local.	Rx.	+383,000	+379,109
NET ..		69,386,000	69,377,831
England	£	15,701,000	15,603,370
Exchange	Rx.	11,838,600	11,854,968
		96,926,500	96,856,169
SURPLUS ..	Rx.	951,400	1,533,998

The surplus of Rx.1,533,998 thus shown on the closed accounts of 1895-6 is not by itself very important, though it may be observed that taking the years 1884-5 to 1894-5 together the surpluses and deficits of the period show a *surplus* balance of Rx.463,326. The surplus for 1895-6 does become significant when we look at it in connexion with the following two summaries.

THE REVISED ESTIMATE OF 1896-7.

Revenue—		Budget.	Revised.
India	Rx.	97,316,800	93,273,600
England	£	174,100	319,400
Exchange	Rx.	129,800	210,800
TOTAL ..	Rx.	97,620,700	93,803,800
Expenditure—			
India—Imperial, Provincial and Local.	Rx.	70,274,900	70,659,400
Adjustments of Provincial and Local.	Rx.	—886,400	—1,228,500
NET ..		69,388,500	69,428,900
England	£	15,909,400	15,880,600
Exchange	Rx.	11,859,700	10,481,200
TOTAL ..	Rx.	97,157,600	95,790,700
Surplus (+) Deficit (—)	Rx.	+463,100	—1,986,900

Here is an estimate worse by Rx.2,450,000 than that originally submitted, an estimate which converts an estimated *surplus* of Rx.463,100 into an estimated *deficit* of Rx.1,986,900. But it is necessary to remember that this also is but an estimate and we cannot hope that the account will be an improvement upon it. The Revenue shows a decline upon the original estimate of no less than Rx.3,817,000, which, however, has been balanced in some measure by the rise in the rate of exchange which the Budget had taken at 13½d., but which averaged, about 14½d. the rupee. The final result is a deficit of about two crores.

In this state of things Sir James Westland's faith is equal to setting forth the *Budget Estimate* for 1897-8, as follows:—

Revenue—		1896-7	1897-8
India	Rx.	97,316,800	95,389,000
England	£	174,100	173,000
Exchange	Rx.	129,800	114,200
TOTAL ..		97,620,000	95,676,800
Expenditure—			
India—Imperial, Provincial and Local.	Rx.	70,274,900	72,623,900
Adjustments of Provincial and Local.	Rx.	—886,400	—1,190,000
NET ..	Rx.	69,388,500	71,433,900
England	£	15,909,400	16,088,500
Exchange	Rx.	11,859,700	10,618,400
TOTAL ..	Rx.	97,157,600	98,140,800
SURPLUS ..	Rx.	463,100	—2,464,000

This shows a system of account-keeping which throws the burden of finding a balance on Providence. It is also somewhat lacking in simplicity and directness. It should be observed that in this Budget Estimate for 1897-8 the comparison is between the original Budget Estimate of 1896-7 which showed a *surplus* of Rx.463,100, instead of with the revised estimate for the same year which shows a *deficit* of Rx.1,986,900. Such a proceeding is very hazardous and time only can show whether the Indian Finance department was warranted in departing from the true basis of estimating, viz., the result of the previous year. But let it be noted that the revised estimate for 1896-7 looked to a *deficit* of Rx.1,986,900, and now again the Budget Estimate for 1897-8 looks for another of Rx.2,464,400.

But here emerges the indomitable optimism, (or a quality which might be denoted by a less euphonious term) of Indian officialdom. We have seen the last report of the Famine and the crowds which must be dependent on the public funds for a long season yet. The official however is bent upon an amelioration of the position, and from a subjective point of view much may be said in favour of such an attitude, though it may be also necessary to remember the tradition that a British official is superior to a Hebrew prophet in that he can contemplate a future

for five minutes or so and yet not confuse it with the present. These estimates however make a rush out of the famine condition, and if the revenue does not improve rapidly, nay, at once, and come up to this tabular expectation, so much the worse for Providence, for it ought. And yet progressive governments in modern times are not conducted so, when they are successful financially. How necessary it is to recollect this in the present case may be shown from two or three facts. There is the direct expenditure in famine relief amounting to Rx. 2,000,000, in 1896-7, the Revenue under several heads in 1896-7 fell seriously, e.g., Land Revenue Rx. 2,432,100, Railway Revenue Rx. 1,420,000, the Opium brought in Rx. 508,600 less and is still falling, and only the rise in Exchange can be put against all this. It is admitted that in 1897-8 the Famine Relief will cost Rx. 3,641,200, and that the loss on Opium will be Rx. 1,079,100. Still more, the capital expenditure is still going on and the Budget estimate does not really disclose the nakedness of the land. For instance, it has now been arranged that the Secretary for India shall not draw for all the Home Charges, but that he shall raise a sterling *Loan* of £3,500,000 by issuing India Stock, and also a temporary loan of £2,000,000. In addition to this, it is proposed to raise a loan in Rupees in India amounting to Rx. 4,000,000. In short, the result on a balance will be that an addition to the debt will be created during the year amounting to Rx. 8,000,000 or so. That is to say, this roseate Budget estimate is based on a rapid improvement of the economic and social condition in India, to be realised within the fiscal year, but even then the position indicated by the tables put forward is got by a process of cancellarial legerdemain by quietly dropping the humdrum and costly process of paying debt, and by the much more easily achieved process of adding some Rx. 8,000,000 to the capital of the debt. There is not among our readers one who does not heartily desire a very speedy resumption of prosperity in India, but nothing is gained by an ingenious covering up of ugly facts such as the above. A brave show is made of an apparent slight decrease in army expenditure. We should be thankful even for an appearance of virtue; this however is an estimate and will the reduction be a fact when the accounts are closed? Of a certainty there is a problem requiring courage and, indeed, hope before those who undertake the administration of Indian affairs; nor can the recent eruptions in certain districts make the task less onerous. In such a position is it too much to expect an increase of candour in the presentation of Indian affairs, both to the native Indian and the despised home reader? It will be better in every way, better for those who so ingeniously and cleverly contrive the accounts now so wonderfully made up, better because the ingenuity is futile and wasted, and better because the governed ones will thereby increasingly learn to place full confidence in those who govern them.

Mr. Alfred Webb, formerly President of the Indian National Congress, contributed to the *Weekly Freeman* (Dublin) of July 17, a valuable article upon the present position in India.

CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.

The following Memorandum has been forwarded to the Secretary of State for India by the Indian Parliamentary Committee:—

To the Right Honourable Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India, India Office, S.W.

MY LORD,—The Indian Parliamentary Committee desire to submit, for the earnest consideration of your Lordship in Council, the accompanying Memorandum on the proposals of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal for altering the constitution of the Calcutta Municipality so as to strengthen the power of the Executive and curtail the authority of the Commissioners. The question is one which excites great interest in Calcutta, and the proposals of the Bengal Government appear open to serious objection.

The Calcutta Municipal Corporation consists of a Chairman and 75 Commissioners, of whom 15 are nominated by Government, 10 are elected by various public bodies, and the remaining 50 are elected by the resident ratepayers of the town. The people of Calcutta are strongly attached to this municipal constitution, under which all interests and classes are fairly represented, and important sanitary improvements have been made.

It will be seen from the Memorandum that the present proposal of the Government would withdraw from the Commissioners in Meeting the right to appoint the higher officials of the Municipality; and (a matter of still greater importance) it would abolish the supervision now exercised by the Commissioners over the proceedings of the Executive. Municipal affairs in Calcutta are at present under the control of a representative body, mainly elected by the ratepayers. Under the new scheme they would pass into the hands of an irresponsible nominee of the Government.

It is urged that the scheme merely proposes to introduce into Calcutta a system which is already in force in Bombay. But that would be a retrograde step. There are serious defects in the Bombay Municipal Act, against which protests have been made from time to time since its enactment. It is precisely similar defects that the Bengal Government now seeks to impose upon Calcutta.

For these reasons, which are more fully set forth in the Memorandum, the Parliamentary Committee desire to express an earnest hope that your Lordship will take the necessary steps to prevent the new proposals from coming into force.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your obedient Servant,

W. WEDDERBURN.

Chairman, Indian Parliamentary Committee.

House of Commons,
July 15, 1897.

MEMORANDUM.

The Calcutta Municipality is perhaps the most important representative body in India entrusted with the management of local affairs. It received its present constitution, with slight modifications to

which reference will presently be made, under Act IV. of 1876. This Act was again amended by Act II. of 1888. Both under the Act of 1876 and the Act of 1888, two-thirds of the members of the Calcutta Municipality were to be elected by the ratepayers. Under the earlier enactment the remaining one-third used to be nominated by the Government. The Act of 1888 represented an advance upon this state of things. Instead of one-third of the members being nominated by the Government, the Act provided that only one-fifth of the members (15 out of 75) should be nominated by the Government, and that of the remaining ten, four were to be elected by the Chamber of Commerce, four by the Calcutta Trades' Association, and two by the Commissioners for making improvements in the port of Calcutta (Section 8 of Act II. of 1888, B.C.). Both under the Act of 1876 and the Act of 1888 the Government reserved to itself the power of appointing a proper person to be the Chairman or the chief executive officer of the Corporation. The Chairman of the Corporation has always been a member of the Covenanted Civil Service. Practically, therefore, the present constitution of the Calcutta Municipality has been in force for the last twenty years, and on the whole has been attended with very good results. It will not be, perhaps, altogether out of place to quote the opinions of two or three high official authorities, with a view to show that the administration of the municipal affairs of Calcutta by the elected Commissioners working under the present constitution has been highly successful, both from a financial and from a sanitary point of view. In 1885 a Commission, appointed by Government to report upon the sanitary condition of Calcutta, observed with regard to the work done by the elected Municipality:—

"ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF WORK DONE.—Before proceeding, however, to detail the results of our enquiries into these matters, and to set forth the conclusions at which we have arrived, we think it right that we should in this place acknowledge and place prominently on record the improvements that have been carried out in the town during the past few years. If much still remains to be done—if the sanitary condition of the town is not yet such as we should like to see it—is, on the other hand, a mistake to suppose that the Commissioners have been idle during the past few years, and that they have altogether neglected the trust that has been reposed in them by the Legislature. On the contrary, our inspections have satisfied us that real and solid progress has been made in the path of sanitary improvement, and it is, as we conceive, our duty to report this fact to the head of the Government from whom we derive our Commission. One of our body, Mr. Beverley, can speak from personal experience on this matter. In 1876, shortly before the present municipal constitution came into being, Mr. Beverley was charged with the duty of taking a census of the town, and in the course of these operations, there was almost no part of the town that he did not visit. In 1880, again, he acted as a Chairman of the Corporation for upwards of seven months; and in the following year he was again employed to take a census of the town. Mr. Beverley is thus in a position to compare the state of the town at the present day with what it was eight and four years ago respectively, and it gives him great pleasure to be able to place on record his personal testimony as to the great improvements that have been made, more especially within the latter period. That these improvements have benefitted the town from a sanitary point of view, cannot, we think, admit of doubt, though the fact may not be capable of easy demonstration from the mortality returns. Whether the sanitary improvement has been as great and as rapid as it might have been—whether the Corporation have done all that they might have done with the

means at their disposal, and whether they have carried out their improvements as expeditiously as possible—are, of course, large questions, upon which men may exist in a difference of opinion. We think it sufficient to say that we are agreed that there has been great and solid improvement."

And, again, the Commission observed:—

"DETAILS OF IMPROVEMENTS EFFECTED.—Holding this opinion as we do, it may not unfairly be expected that we should set out in some detail the particular improvements to which we refer; and we venture to think that this course will be attended with considerable advantage. Calcutta covers an area of about eight square miles, and few of its European residents at any rate are intimately acquainted with the northern portion of the town. Still fewer, perhaps, are acquainted with the history of the town and of its sanitary condition in the past. Persons read a description of some noxious bustle or tank in the Health Officer's reports, and are amazed to find that the entire city is not like Chowringhee and Dalhousie Square. Ignorant or forgetful of what Calcutta was no longer than twenty or thirty years ago, they perhaps jump to the conclusion that the insanitary conditions brought to notice are due to laxity of administration on the part of the present Corporation, instead of being to a great extent the legacy of past neglect. For the information of such persons, then, we think it will be useful to indicate in some detail, without going into minute particulars, some of the principal improvements that have been effected within the last few years."

The Hon. Mr. Colman Macaulay, late Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, thus observed from his place in the Bengal Legislative Council, in 1888, when the Bill amending the Act of 1876 was being considered:—

"To guard against misunderstanding, I wish to state my distinctive opinion that the working of the elective system in Calcutta has been a decided success. I cannot agree with my hon. friend, Sir Henry Harrison, in thinking that if we were beginning to legislate for an elective system we might take the Hon. Mr. Irving's proposal for electing only one-half. I think that, looking to the experience we have had of the working of the system as a whole, we should be fully justified, were we in the position of our predecessors, the legislators of 1876, in taking the proportion of two-thirds elected by the ratepayers. For this reason I will certainly oppose my friend the Hon. Mr. Irving's amendment. The elective system has brought forward men like my friend the Hon. Babu Kally Nath Mitter, men of ability and business habits, who have done excellent service to the community, and I think that all friends of self-government must rejoice that these men owe their positions, not to the voice of nomination, but to the suffrages of their fellow-townsmen." (14th February, 1888.)

There was no higher authority upon the municipal affairs of Calcutta than the late Sir Henry Harrison, who was for a number of years Chairman of the Corporation and the author of the amending Act of 1888, which it is now proposed to amend. This is what he said in 1888:—

"In the first place, by the elective system we have attracted to the Corporation a number of Commissioners who have taken the greatest possible interest in the work.—Commissioners who have been most assiduous in their attendance at meetings—who have looked into matters with care and scrutiny such as is hardly found in any other department. They have set their face resolutely against all extravagance; they have thrown the light of discussion on every detail. In fact, it has led to the administration of the Municipality being carried on much more in the light of day than it would have been as far as other members are concerned. On questions of contracts and expenditure in detail, they have paid an attention to the work which was hardly paid before. In the next place, the system has had the advantage of bringing in a number of men who owe their position entirely to something outside Government, not to nomination. They feel that they depend for their position on those who have returned them, and who naturally look to them to represent their views, and therefore they bring

with them the light of real public opinion of a certain class—a comparatively small class in numbers, but a very influential class indeed—and it has been a great advantage that we should have the opinion of a class of this kind pressed upon us, so that we know what they want and what they object to. Thirdly, we have persons who represent local areas. This has led to many good results. Previously the town was looked upon very much as a whole, and the wants of the town as a whole were considered. Now the desire for large improvements has decreased, and the Commissioners are more interested in local wants. This has to some extent worked well, and the large increase in the value of property is in no small degree due to the way in which local improvements have been attended to. Fourthly, the elective system has been successful in this, that people know that they have a Commissioner who represents them, and when they have a complaint, if it is not immediately attended to by the Executive, they appeal to get the assistance of their Commissioner. This has some beneficial results; it causes some degree of self-reliance in the people when they know that they have someone to whom they can go if they do not get immediate redress. The last and most important result is this. The elected Commissioners, who have taken so much interest in the affairs of the Municipality, have themselves improved much by experience in the work. I have seen very great improvement in the tone and method and manner of doing work by the Commissioners who have become familiarised with their labours. In this review I think that I have given a very fair account of the work of the elective Commissioners; but after all is said, is not the *role* which I have described precisely the *role* of opposition? We all know that administrative affairs suffer if there is no effective check; and, whether we look at the official world as it exists in India, or at the Government as it is in England, worked by party, it is a well-recognised fact that, if there is no adequate check, there is danger either of the work going on too fast, or there is danger of its not being as economical as it might be. The *role* which the elective Commissioners for the native wards have at once assumed is precisely that of checking, watching and controlling in every way, in seeing either that no expenditure is incurred without sufficient reason, or that projects of improvement are not undertaken which cannot fully be justified." (4th February, 1883.)

Since the Corporation has been constituted upon a popular basis it has spent Rs. 24,702,357 upon works of sanitation, and yet its financial position is so assured, and its credit has so improved, that whereas before 1891 it could borrow only at the rate of 5 per cent., it now borrows at the rate of 3½ per cent.

It is now proposed by Sir Alexander Mackenzie, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, to alter the constitution with a view to strengthen the Executive and to diminish the authority of the Commissioners. No complaint has ever been made that the Executive was weak; and it is remarkable that when the Act came up for amendment in 1888, the member in charge of the Bill, who was the Head of the Executive of the Corporation and had the largest experience as its Head, did not think it necessary to alter the Act upon the lines now suggested. It is proposed to assimilate the Calcutta Municipal Act to the Bombay Municipal Act. If the statute-book were a *tabula rasa*, upon which the legislator might inscribe what he liked, there might have been less objection to the procedure. But the people of Bengal have a legitimate grievance when they find a law which had, on the whole, worked well replaced by what must be regarded, in relation to the Calcutta Municipal Act, as a retrograde enactment. In illustration of this remark, one or two facts may be cited. Under the Bombay Municipal Act, the Head of the Executive, or Municipal Commissioner, as he is called,

appoints all officers of the Corporation except the Deputy-Commissioner, the Executive Health Officer, the Engineer, and the Municipal Secretary. With the exception of the Municipal Secretary, who is appointed by a Standing Committee, the other officers named above are appointed by the Corporation. Under the Calcutta Municipal Act, all officers drawing a salary of Rs. 200 a month and under are appointed by the Chairman (the Head of the Executive). In respect of appointments carrying a salary of over Rs. 200 a month and below Rs. 500 a month, the Chairman nominates three persons and the Commissioners appoint one of them; the Commissioners cannot appoint anyone except from among the persons nominated by the Chairman. All appointments carrying a salary of Rs. 500 and upward are made by the Commissioners in meeting. The Calcutta Commissioners as a body have thus, in regard to their appointments, much more authority than that which the Bombay Corporation possesses. The result has been that a large number of Indian gentlemen fill the more responsible offices in the Municipality. If the Lieutenant-Governor's proposals were given effect to, and the Acts assimilated to the Bombay Act, the power possessed by the Calcutta Corporation in this respect would be withdrawn. Then, again, under the Calcutta Municipal Act, the Corporation exercises a general power of supervision over the proceedings of the Executive; and the Executive is held responsible to the Commissioners. The Bombay Act does not provide for this general power of supervision. The Head of the Executive is independent of the Corporation in many respects. If anything, this is a defect in the Bombay Act. Where there is financial control and responsibility, all other kinds of control should follow as a matter of course. In Bombay it was an Indian medical practitioner, who was a member of the Corporation, who first brought the occurrence of plague cases to the notice of the Executive, who, however, did not take adequate notice of the matter for some little time.

The serious change of the law which is proposed is altogether independent of any apprehension with regard to the outbreak of the plague in Calcutta. As a matter of fact the plague has broken out in Bombay, where the Executive is strong; it has not broken out in Calcutta, where the Executive is supposed to be weak. To meet the crisis caused by the plague, a Medical Board has been appointed in supersession of the Municipality. As this is only a temporary organisation which has been devised to meet a temporary emergency, not much can be said for or against it. But what is objected to is that the constitution of the Municipality should be permanently altered for the worse, when as a matter of fact the plague has not broken out in Calcutta, and when the Municipality has been relieved of all responsibility in regard to the plague by the formation of a distinct body, the Medical Board, which is to direct all preventive measures in connexion with the plague. It may possibly be argued that without denying that the existing system has worked well, and that much improvement has taken place in Calcutta and its suburbs since popular control has

been introduced, still admittedly a good deal remains to be done—perfection has by no means been attained; and the Government may be right in asserting that the weakness of the Executive of which they complain is chiefly responsible for this, and that the strengthening of the Executive, which they now contemplate, may very probably expedite those further improvements which are admittedly desiderata. What, however, are the facts? For nearly a hundred years the entire control of the administration of Calcutta rested with the Executive, and the result of this was that Mr. (now Sir) J. Strachey declared Calcutta to be the filthiest and most insanitary city in the world, a permanent source of danger to the Province, and a disgrace to any civilised Government. It was then gradually realised that some popular element must be introduced into the administration of the city—that the people who with their families had to live, and most of them sooner or later to die, there must have a really potential voice in the management of affairs in which their interests were paramount; and in view to carry out this reform, the Municipal Acts which have worked so well were passed. It is to give greater powers to the Executive that the Bengal Government now propose to modify these Acts. And why. Because, despite the constant efforts of the Commissioners, they have not in twenty years been able entirely to repair the errors of omission and commission with which the former unchecked Executive had afflicted the city and converted it into a pest-house. In other words, instead of moving forwards and increasing the strength of the popular element to which all progress has been due, it is proposed to diminish this and revive to a certain extent the autocratic power of the Executive. Properly understood, the argument is too absurd to be seriously considered; and all who wish the people of Calcutta well, and all who have any care for the credit of British rule, will strenuously oppose this retrograde proposal.

The following reply to the above memorandum has been received by the Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee:

"India Office, Whitehall, London, S.W.

"July 26, 1897.

"Sir.—I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated the 15 July, 1897, concerning proposals, which you describe, for reforming the Calcutta Municipality.

"In reply, I am directed to state that no report on these proposals, and no copy of a Bill for amending the Calcutta Municipality Act has as yet reached the Secretary of State for India. He will, however, make enquiry, and when such report or Bill reaches him, Lord George Hamilton will give due weight to the remarks contained in your letter and its enclosure.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"Sir Wm. Wedderburn, M.P."

"A. GODLEY.

Sir W. Wedderburn has given notice of motion as follows:—East India (Village Enquiries).—That, looking to the grievous sufferings endured by the people of India during the present year, this House is of opinion that a detailed and searching Village Enquiry should be instituted, in order to ascertain the causes which blight the industry of the cultivators and render them helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine and pestilence.

THE QUEEN AND HER INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SPEECH BY MR. JUSTICE RANADE.

On Tuesday afternoon, June 22—the day, it will be remembered, of the assassinations at Poona—the Principal and the Professors of Elphinstone College, Bombay, gave an "At Home" to past and present Elphinstonians by way of celebrating the Diamond Jubilee. We reprint from the *Times of India* of June 25 the following admirable speech delivered on the occasion by that distinguished Indian and Congress-wallah, Mr. Justice Ranade:—

"The Hon. Mr. Justice M. G. Ranade said: Mr. Principal and Professors, Ladies, and Fellow-students.—The only claim I have to speak at this gathering on behalf of the students both old and new is that I am perhaps the oldest Elphinstonian present here to-day, having joined the College nearly forty years ago. If not the oldest, I can certainly claim to be one who stayed longest within these walls; for, as student and as teacher, I was associated with the College for nearly fourteen years, with one slight interruption. There are times, ladies and gentlemen, when our hearts are too full to permit of our giving adequate expression to the feelings which move us. This is just one of those occasions when all over the world, and notably in this country, in all our towns and villages, as well as in these busy Presidency centres, there is one central dominating idea exciting the imagination of millions in a way that cannot be easily compared to any similar event in our past history. Of course our past history furnishes parallels of Sovereigns ruling over vast territories for more than half a century, and ruling over many millions of subjects with beneficence and wisdom. But nowhere except in the remotest part of mythical story was there a commemoration so unique and universal as that which we witness before our eyes, not merely in the British Isles, but in all the great colonies and dependencies, in the four great continents, which own allegiance to the rule of our Empress-Queen. As students of history we should try to understand what lies at the root of all this wonderful manifestation of the devotion of millions and millions of men of all creeds and races to a ruler whom they perchance have never seen and will never see. Mere length of life cannot explain this phenomenon, for after all long life is an accidental advantage which it is not given to man to command. The possession of power and of a world-wide empire by itself, whatever fear it might inspire, can never succeed in winning the hearts of millions over whom that power is exercised. There is something deeper than these possessions and accidents which at the present time have thrown a spell over all of us, and brought us together here to commemorate the sixtieth anniversary of her Majesty's reign. There is a moral element at the base of all this display of force, and it is the triumph of this moral principle which alone has the power to move the hearts of millions in one unison of loyal and grateful sentiment. The Queen-Empress typifies in her person the ascendancy of the reign of law in all departments of State activity. Herself a woman, she sits enthroned as the responsible head of the mightiest empire the world has yet known, and her personal character has enabled her to realize her responsibility as a constitutional ruler in a way which no mere paper constitutions, however skilfully framed, can ever secure. Some of you might think that after all law is but the expression of the Sovereign's will, and there is nothing in such an expression of the Sovereign's will which differentiates it in degree or kind from other expressions of her will which we distinguish as orders and rules meant for executive convenience. To those who feel this difficulty I would suggest that they should turn their eyes inside into the recesses of their own hearts and see, if they can, if there is any law which is enthroned in their own hearts with authority if not power to rule over their own multifarious nature, passions, appetites, loves, hatred. Their weakness is greatest when they yield obedience to these lower powers and disown the command of the law imprinted on their hearts. Their strength is irresistible when they regulate and subordinate their faculties and possessions to the rule of the Sovereign law enthroned in their hearts. The difference between man and man is a difference between obedience and disobedience to

this law. What is true of the individual is if possible still more true in the case of collective bodies of men known as nations and empires. The British nation has its own faults and foibles; but there can be no question that in spite of these faults and foibles their national character has been formed by ages of struggle and self-discipline in a world which illustrates better than any other contemporary power the supremacy of what I have characterized as the reign of law. Just as in the individual the will when counselled and perfected by discipline and struggle becomes the law for the man who listens to it, so in the collective nation it is when the Sovereign's will is similarly counselled and perfected by the advice of the estates and the free expression of public opinion becomes the dominant power in the land to which every other subordinate power has to yield obedience, and which it has to carry out ungrudgingly. This is the secret of the moral force which sanctifies the sway of Britain over one-fifth of the globe and its entire population. In the absence of such a discipline mere power and fortune has a tendency to make men feel giddy till oftentimes their very greatness helps to precipitate them into ruin. It is this moral principle which is the source of British greatness and its armour and protection. It is also this same moral element which inspires hope and confidence in the colonies and dependencies of Great Britain that whatever temporary perturbations may cloud the judgment the reign of law will assert itself in the end. The long reign of her Majesty has tended to strengthen the hold of this principle on the national mind, and her great personal ascendancy is never so keenly appreciated as when she announces her determination to hold fast to this source of strength and to sympathise with the weaknesses, sorrows and sufferings of all her subjects. There have been in our own country good and beneficent sovereigns, but their good and beneficent work dies with them. It is otherwise where impersonal law presides and rules over the destinies of men. There are of course ebbs and tides and temporary disturbances and even storms, but these only serve to bring into greater relief the calm majesty of the law overriding power and possession more especially when this law is administered by the womanly instincts of one who has known sorrow and affliction herself. This is the moral secret of the charm which has endeared her name to millions and millions who have never seen her. This is why all the colonies and dependencies join with the British Isles in this commemoration, and this is the lesson which on an occasion like this I would ask the students of this college to take with them as the memory of an event which cannot fail to be remembered as a red-letter day in our country's annals. On behalf of the students I have great pleasure in thanking the Principal and Professors of the College for their kindness in inviting us all to take part in this commemorative gathering, and I hope such occasions will be far more frequent than they have hitherto been." (Loud cheers.)

INTERFERENCE WITH NATIVE DOMESTIC CUSTOM.

The native newspapers only expressed the general feeling in stating that never since the establishment of British rule had there been so widespread an attempt to interfere with native domestic custom. This feeling found its wild outburst in the resolve to assassinate the chief officers charged with the task of stamping out the plague in Poona. A Hindu of good caste prefers death itself to an irretrievable breach of caste and to the loss of the purifying funeral rites, which, in his imagination, is involved by removal to a hospital. So far as Lord Sandhurst's statements enable us to judge the officials perfectly appreciated this feeling and did their utmost to assuage it. By associating the search parties with lady-doctors, with Hindus of good caste, and with responsible European officers, they endeavoured to give every guarantee that legitimate prejudices would be respected in the execution of a harsh duty. But the duty had to be done if the plague was to be kept under control. It is one of those painful conflicts which must from time to time arise between the dictates of modern humanity and the traditions of Hindu life. On two former occasions—the abolition of widow burning and the suppression of infanticide—the same conflict arose. But in those days there were no telegraphic agencies or special correspondents, and the local opposition received neither countenance nor support from the outside world.—*The Times* ("Indian Affairs"), July 19.

NOTICE TO OUR READERS.

WEEKLY ISSUE OF "INDIA."

We have the pleasure to announce that on and after Friday, January 7th, of next year (1898) INDIA will be published weekly.

The Annual Subscription in India will continue to be six rupees (Rs. 6) post free.

It is hoped that by this important change the usefulness of the journal as an advocate of constitutional reform will be greatly increased and that, arriving in India by every mail, and bringing the latest news from London, the journal will appeal to a much larger number of readers than is likely to be reached by a monthly publication.

Further particulars will be given later. Meantime it is hoped that readers of INDIA will make known to their friends the proposed change by which, without any increase of the Indian subscription, 52 weekly issues will be substituted for 12 monthly issues.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, AUGUST, 1897.

WANTED: A JUDICIAL ENQUIRY.

LITTLE by little one is coming to learn the marks of the true Imperialist. Even the average man occasionally permits himself a *non sequitur*, and becomes the victim of groundless fears. Your true Imperialist, it would seem, raises these errors to the rank of a political system, founded upon the capacity of rushing to conclusions and losing one's head. We have lately had an object-lesson in this system on the grand scale. Two British officers, engaged in stamping out the plague in Poona, are assassinated. A week later there is a riot in a suburb of Calcutta. One would have thought that in these circumstances the business of statesmanship was carefully to ascertain the circumstances which had led up to two separate occurrences in two widely sundered parts of India, to weigh all available evidence, and, when a reasonable conclusion had been obtained, to act with calmness and decision. But that is not your Imperialist's way. Is there assassination? Then the native Press is solely to blame. Is there a riot? Then we must abolish education in India. The riot and the assassination are promptly assumed not only to be due to one and the same cause, but also to be symptoms of general unrest. Thereupon the true Imperialist falls into a great panic, talks and writes about the imminence of a second Mutiny, clamours for repression on the instant, and, by way of smoothing matters a little, describes Indians as niggers and

tigers. So impatient is he, through mingled wrath and apprehension, that anybody who dares to speak of evidence is denounced as an insolent traitor, and anybody who hints that enquiry should precede coercive measures is stigmatised as a weakling ignorant of the maxims of statecraft. Needless to say, it is mere folly to argue with the Imperialist when the fit is upon him. The best treatment is to give him scope until his fever wears itself out, and then he may come to be a little ashamed of himself, a little distrustful of his hasty arrogance, and a little inclined to admit that evidence is not such a bad thing after all. There are signs that the Jingo Press in London is cooling down somewhat after the high fever which raged during the last week of June and the first fortnight of July. One hears rather less now of the proposal to gag the native Press in India, and to confound innocent and guilty in a common punishment. The anonymous traducer is, no doubt, still at work in the columns of the journal which owes so much to those twin pillars of literary Imperialism, Mr. Houston and Mr. Pigott. But on the whole the London Jingoism seems at last to be rather on the way to perceive that vituperation is not a good healer of unrest, that the trial should come before the verdict, and (especially, perhaps) that where the methods and the manner of a section of the Indian Press are in question, the English Press, from the *Daily Mail* upwards, does not set a good example if it abandons itself to an orgie of scurrility and unproved allegation.

We discuss the Chitpur riot elsewhere. Here we are concerned with a totally distinct matter—the murder of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst at Poona, a cowardly and revolting crime as to which, if we may borrow the words of "Loyal Indian's," admirable letter printed in the *Daily News* of July 2, "every friend of peace and order, be he Englishman or be he Indian, hopes that the perpetrators of the 'foul deed will be hanged.'" So far it does not appear that any trustworthy clue to the assassin or the assassins has been obtained—a fact not devoid, perhaps, of a significance of its own. But a Reuter's telegram dated Bombay, July 22, mentioned a report that "certain editors of the Poona papers" were to be tried at Bombay before the chief magistrate, whose departure for England on furlough had been suddenly cancelled, and that the Government contemplated offering a free pardon in return for the evidence of any one who was privy to the murders but not the actual perpetrator or instigator of them. This proposed trial of Indian journalists under the ordinary law, presumably for incitement to murder, is a sufficient answer to the short-sighted busybodies who, so soon as news of the crime reached London, rushed into print with a panacea for troubles in India in the form of a proposal to gag the press. The telegram of July 22 reminds us that, where an offence is proved, the Penal Code is capable of dealing with it. Whether the offence will be proved in the present instance is, of course, another matter. One can only say that the series of "elegant extracts" from the native press which were lately printed in the *Times*, and which were no doubt the most offensive passages that the zealous compiler could at the moment discover, came very

far short of incitement to murder though they undoubtedly contained extravagant and deplorable balderdash. If, however, articles have been printed in the Poona newspapers which bring their authors and publishers within the law, proof of the offence will be easy, and the punishment will not be, as it ought not to be, lacking in severity. But the duty of the authorities in this matter will not end with the detection and the punishment of the murderers and the instigators of murder. It is imperative that full enquiry should be made into the circumstances which led up to the crimes, and especially into the detailed allegations which were made in the Poona memorial of May 10. The importance of this document, which we print on another page, is beyond question. If anybody believes that 2,000 of the citizens of Poona—Hindus and Muhammadans alike—and the presidents of the leading Hindu and Muhammadan associations in the Deccan, could be induced to unite in the presentation of a fictitious memorial to the Government of Bombay, he is capable of believing anything. The memorial was accompanied by detailed statements regarding each complaint, and these statements were signed by the persons aggrieved. This fact is specially important as some of the offences in respect of which complaint is made are such as to involve the sufferer in loss of caste. It is no small thing that the aggrieved parties should have testified personally to grievances which also meant profound and lasting disgrace. Certain writers in the London Jingo press have permitted themselves to describe the allegations brought against some of the British soldiers at Poona as anonymous. This is a piece of misapprehension, if it be not a piece of misrepresentation. It is "Scrutator" of the *Times* who is anonymous. The Poona complainants, both in the memorial and in the Poona newspapers, have given their names.

When Sir W. Wedderburn, in the House of Commons on July 1, called Lord George Hamilton's attention to the Poona memorial, Lord George expressed his confidence that Lord Sandhurst had been and was most careful to confine the action of the authorities to what was absolutely necessary for checking the plague and to show all possible consideration to the religious opinions and customs of the inhabitants. Lord George's confidence in this connexion is well merited, and we share it to the full. Lord Sandhurst, as we have testified on more than one occasion, has won golden opinions in Bombay as a just and sympathetic governor who is anxious to appreciate the wishes and sentiments of the people. For an illustration of his carefulness and tact one need not go further than the Blue-book on the plague which was issued a fortnight ago. There one sees Lord Sandhurst resisting, in the case of Bombay, certain drastic measures against the plague which the Government of India recommended and insisted upon without adequate knowledge of local difficulties. Lord Sandhurst wrote, for example, on February 12, to the Government of India:—

"Great difficulty has attended all attempts at the segregation of healthy inmates of infected houses hitherto made, and very limited success has been achieved. From the beginning of the outbreak of this disease it has been found that the native inhabitants of the city are very reluctant to leave their houses or to allow any member of their family afflicted with

the disease to be taken away. Indeed, their dread of the disease appears to be hardly so profound as their horror of being removed from their houses. They are far more easily moved by fear of the municipal and police authorities than by any realisation of the benefits that will accrue from a sensible course of action. It is estimated that not less than 300,000 persons have already fled from Bombay, moved so to do not only by fear of the plague, but quite as much if not more by an unfounded and unreasonable fear of what might happen to them at the hands of the police and municipal authorities were they to remain."

These remarks were provoked by the suggestion that the inmates of infected houses in Bombay should be removed to health camps in the open. It is worth noting that this strong measure was enforced in Poona, and that the Poona memorial complains of the hurrying of relatives and neighbours of plague patients to the segregation camps before they had made proper arrangements for the custody of property in their houses. The important point is, however, that the alarm observed by Lord Sandhurst in Bombay must have been greatly increased in Poona through the employment of European soldiers. In these circumstances there was abundant room, if not for offence, at least for misapprehension, for even the most devoted admirer of Tommy Atkins would hardly describe him as a model of thoughtfulness and tact. Now, we do not say that the Poona memorial and the complaints published in the Poona newspapers are proof that offences were committed, but we do say they are conclusive proof of a widespread belief that offences were committed, and that they constitute an irresistible case for full and impartial enquiry. The pity of it is that enquiry was not immediately undertaken. Lord George Hamilton stated on July 15 in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn that the Government of Bombay, on receipt of the memorial, directed Mr. Rand to report upon the allegations. That was a rather curious proceeding in view of the fact that the memorial was addressed to the Government of Bombay for the avowed reason that remonstrances addressed to the Plague Committee at Poona had produced no effect. There is also an odd discrepancy in the dates. The memorial was dated May 10. The Government of Bombay states that it was not received until May 21. Mr. Rand was shot at on June 22, but "the report was still incomplete at the time of his murder." We may add that on July 7 we learned by telegram from Poona that no reply of any kind had been received by the memorialists, and that, so far as the memorialists are aware, no enquiry was made with reference to their allegations. It is obvious that the matter cannot be allowed to rest here. Lord George Hamilton, it is true, telegraphed early in July to the Bombay Government for a "categorical reply" to each series of complaints, and on July 5 read to the House of Commons what he was pleased to call a "full reply." We analyse this remarkable document on another page. Here we need only observe that the epithet "full" was not applied to it by its authors, and is not likely to be applied to it by any candid reader. It appears from more than one of Lord George Hamilton's statements that the police are now enquiring into the "causes and circumstances" of the murders. But a police enquiry, necessary though it may be so far as it goes, is by no means adequate. What is wanted is

obviously a judicial enquiry, and the need for enquiry of this kind is immeasurably increased by the lapse of time since the presentation of the memorial. Let us not forget (i) that the memorial was dated six weeks, and is admitted to have been received by the Government of Bombay four weeks, before the assassinations took place, and (ii) that the memorialists had up to a fortnight ago received no reply. These, it seems to us, are facts of paramount importance, and the authorities here and in India will not meet the necessities of the case unless a strictly judicial enquiry is forthwith instituted.

THAT BLESSED WORD—"PRIVATION."

THE further papers regarding the Famine and the Relief Operations in India (No. III), which have recently been issued as a Parliamentary Blue-book, have a special interest as affording some tardy official information with respect to the mortality attendant upon the present famine. Doubtless the phrase "mortality attendant upon famine" is one which will commend itself to the officials, some of whom, though death-rates have been doubled and trebled, still strangely persist in asserting that there are only very few deaths from starvation—"directly or indirectly due to privation" practically represents the utmost in this connexion that official lips can bring themselves to pronounce. It may be well, therefore, to examine briefly the state of affairs disclosed by the Blue-book. In the Central Provinces the years 1891 and 1895 were very unhealthy. In each of those years there were 30,000 or 40,000 deaths in excess of the average for the ten years 1885-1894. The year 1896, however, shows an excess mortality of about 120,000 when compared with the two preceding bad years, or something like 150,000 deaths above the normal. The mean death-rate of the year reached the alarming figure of 49·05 *per mille*. Even for the early months of 1897 general figures are not available, but the figures for the districts of the Jubbulpore Division continue to be appallingly high. If one omits decimals, the following are the monthly death-rates *per mille per annum* from August, 1896, to February, 1897. In order to appreciate the magnitude of the figures, it should be remembered that in normal years the death-rate for these districts during these months ranges between thirty and forty, only occasionally and for a brief period reaching fifty or over.

DEATH-RATES *per mille per annum*.

District.	1896.					1897.	
	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.
Jubbulpore ..	91	97	89	61	59	107	83
Saugor ..	98	99	97	75	67	63	59
Damoh ..	129	138	129	94	70	64	52
Seoni ..	88	71	73	61	56	63	53
Mandla ..	140	108	72	42	48	46	85
Murwara ..	99	103	91	71	75	?	198

With regard to the Central Provinces, the Secretary of State for India sums up the position a few months ago in the following words:—

"The death rate in some parts of the Central Provinces was very high; I observe the monthly famine statement gives the 'deaths due directly or indirectly to the effects of privation'

in the whole of the Central Provinces as 4,385 during the month of January."

In the Jubbulpore district alone (the worst) the deaths from starvation were 2,052 for December, and 2,708 for January. In the Bilaspur district there were in February "four hundred and seventy-eight deaths from starvation . . . as compared "with 160 in January." It is tolerably certain that all these figures are serious under-statements. How far they may be so vitiated one cannot say, but one cannot place much confidence in the completeness of reports which contain remarks of this character:—

"Deaths from starvation—Uchhangabad—None reported. Eighty-four deaths from privation" (at p. 75 of the Blue-book).

and again on the same page:—

"Narsinghpur.—Three hundred and ninety-six [i.e., deaths from starvation] outside poor-houses. Number said to be exaggerated."

Said to be exaggerated!

And again:—"excluding deaths in poor-houses "which cannot be described as 'from starvation.'" Yet it is just in the poor-houses that the wretched people, when they can reach them, come to die. It seems to us that these evasive distinctions between "privation" and "starvation" are all beside the mark. It is trifling with the question to display this sorry zeal for a misleading appearance of precision when the people are dying through famine in hundreds. But what can one expect when the highest officials of Government by their telegraphic orders to the district officers practically discountenance, and it would seem almost prohibit, the reporting of deaths as due to starvation? This refusal to see and recognise the worst, which has characterized the attitude of the Government of India from the beginning of the famine, is not creditable to the authorities concerned.

In the North-West Provinces the situation is quite as grave. The following figures taken from tables at pp. 92 and 203 of the Blue-book, show how heavy the mortality has been in some of the distressed districts during the three months of December, 1896, January and February, 1897:—

DEATH-RATE *per mille per annum*.

District	Three Months ending February, 1897.	Average Ten Years Previous.	Excess Deaths per Million of Population.
	February, 1897.	Previous.	
Fatehpur ..	15·86	9·09	6,750
Banda ..	14·62	7·96	6,660
Hemirpur ..	14·02	8·69	5,330
Allahabad ..	10·37	6·90	3,470
Jhansi ..	14·37	8·39	5,960
Lucknow ..	10·40	7·67	2,830
Rai Bareilly ..	12·90	7·80	5,100
Hardoi ..	7·88	4·62	3,260

As the population of these eight districts was nearly six and a-half millions at the census of 1891, the figures given above represent an excess mortality during three months of 30,000 to 35,000 persons. In the month of February last, out of thirty-seven famine districts throughout the North-West Provinces, no fewer than seventeen showed a death-rate exceeding the normal by 50 per cent. and upwards, while in six of these the death-rate was more than double the normal. In the other provinces of

¹ Two months—December, 1896, and January, 1897.

India affected by the famine the death-rate up to January and February, 1897, was normal or below normal on the whole. But it is to be noted that in the distressed districts, even in those provinces which are enjoying an exceptionally healthy season, the mortality is above the normal; though perhaps not more so than might reasonably be expected in a time of famine. It is the unusually healthy conditions prevailing in other respects which produce this favourable result. Now, it is not contended that epidemic diseases are peculiarly prevalent in the North-West Provinces and in the Central Provinces. The question therefore arises, why has the death-rate in these two provinces reached such alarming proportions? To answer that in these two provinces distress has been most severe, does not get rid of the fact that the relief operations in these provinces have partially and in some cases seriously failed. There are two—and, so far as one can see, only two—alternative explanations of the fact. Either the severity of the famine is such that this high mortality is, humanly speaking, unavoidable; or the authorities, imperial or local or both, were wholly unprepared to meet a calamity for which they had been preparing for at least fifteen years, and of which they had had ample warning. In the first alternative it is obvious that the Government of India at the first egregiously under-estimated both the extent and the intensity of the present distress, a failure which would not fail to militate against a successful campaign with the famine. In the second alternative, the sole question is, Why were the Government unprepared? There is, of course, this wider question—how it comes about that the people of India are unable to withstand even the first assaults of famine. But whatever may be the causes underlying this phenomenon, there remains this unfortunate fact of the heavy mortality in the Central Provinces and the North-West Provinces, confronting the Government and calling for an explanation.

It is necessary to add a word or two about the famine statistics, and the method of their reluctant presentation. A perusal of the tables in the Blue-book leaves the impression that the officers of Government, whatever their gifts, have not the gift of clear expression. Anything more confusing and heterogeneous than the various tables of mortality sent in by different officers it is difficult to conceive. Sometimes the death-rate is calculated in one way, sometimes in another way; sometimes for the same place and period of time it appears to vary on different pages of the Blue-book; sometimes for different districts of the same province diverse periods of time are taken. In some places the figures are months behind the figures for other places. In some the comparison is made with a ten years' average, in others with the previous year, while in others a distinction is drawn between the distressed area in a district and the whole district. Nor are clerical blunders wanting. Thus on pages 24 and 29 there seems to be a hopeless muddle about the month to which certain figures refer. Is it November or December, 1896? or January, 1897? Presumably the month is December, 1896, though the figures are given in a return for January, 1897.

This reading involves the correction of "December" in a certain line to "November" in order to make sense. [And see p. 65.] And so forth, and so on. What one cannot understand is why there should be all this confusion and concealment, for that is what it seems to amount to. Apparently the Government of India receive the monthly death-rates from the various districts within six weeks. For instance, the figures for January in the Central Provinces are contained in a report dated 16 March. Why cannot all these returns be dealt with on one uniform plan and published in a form which would be intelligible to the public? What is wanted is very simple. A monthly return containing the following five columns would make everything clear:—(1) The name of the district; (2) The normal number of deaths for the month calculated from the average death-rate for the past ten years; (3) The actual number of deaths; (4) The number of deaths in excess of the normal; (5) Remarks. Unless the Government are bent on withholding the facts from the public one fails to see what possible objection there can be to such a return. If it be pleaded that the officials in India have not time to spare for such work, there would seem to be a two-fold answer. For the return which we have suggested might well take the place of many other elaborate and uninforming documents, and it might easily be compiled at the India Office from data that lie ready to hand.

NATIVE OPINION AND THE POONA OUTRAGE.

[FROM "THE TIMES."]

The arrival of the mail enables us to judge of the attitude of the Indian Press towards the recent murders at Poona. It is clear that for some months back certain Bombay native journals have used wildly-excited language in regard to the measures taken to stamp out the plague. A house-to-house visitation by Europeans, and their unavoidable intrusion on the privacy of women and the sanctity of domestic shrines in infected dwellings, could not be stripped of its terrors even by associating Indian gentlemen and English ladies in the harsh duty. Nor could any argument soften the pangs of parting with a wife or daughter forcibly carried off, by however humane hands, to a public hospital. The conflict between caste traditions and the imperative demands of public safety was sufficiently acute even in semi-European capitals like Calcutta and Bombay. In Poona, the ancient centre of Brahmin influence, it reached its climax and broke out in a wild act of protest or revenge.

The most excited of the native editors only represented the excitement of the communities whom they served. Some of their expressions, when read by the light of the subsequent tragedy, perhaps acquire a significance which they did not at the time possess. Anglo-Indian journalists have brought together a collection of the worst specimens. The *Bombay Gazette* writes:—

One paper early in April told the public that "oppressive

regimes are overthrown by agencies sent by God." Another expressed astonishment that people should be so meek as to bear the oppression of "bands of Pindarees"—meaning thereby the soldiers employed in stamping out the plague—and adjured them to "make a movement" to deliver themselves and their kindred from outrage. A third stigmatised the authorities as "butchers," and predicted a renewal of the scenes of the Mutiny. A fourth—which, indeed, in many respects stood first in this connexion—informed the Poona public that they were under a "Reign of Terror," and enumerated all the horrors they were compelled to undergo.

All this, and other perilous stuff of like nature, had been circulated in certain of the native journals throughout the long struggle of the local authorities with the plague. No words more cruel could have been spoken of the Englishmen and Englishwomen who at the peril of their own lives were seeking out the unfortunates whom the malady had stricken, and were striving to give them the best chance of recovery. The task of succour and rescue amid hotbeds of infection, and face to face with all the loathsome horrors of the bubonic plague, was left in medieval Europe to the most devoted orders of the Church. In India it has been performed simply as a matter of duty by our countrymen and countrywomen, from high officials and delicate ladies down to police inspectors and private soldiers. Words such as the *Bombay Gazette* quotes were a poor return for heroic efforts to save the people from themselves. But they were the words of terror and ignorance; most of them probably written in a despairing hope that the authorities might be frightened by abuse or vague threats into leaving the stricken ones to die in the old fashion, in their own homes. Some, perhaps, may have had a deeper meaning—a meaning which once again reminds us of that seething surface, of discontent which the over-production of a clerical class, for whom there is no adequate career, has spread over the centres of Western education in India.

There can, however, be no question as to the genuine reprobation with which the news of the tragedy has been condemned by the leading members of the native Press. We make it our duty week by week to look through the principal organs of native opinion in the three Presidencies. They are necessarily but a few out of hundreds, but they were impartially selected to keep us informed of the views and feelings of the chief recognised sections of the Indian people who read newspapers. If any of the obscurer vernacular journals have used this outrage as an occasion for parading sedition, the Government will know how to act. We propose to summarise the terms in which the acknowledged organs of Indian opinion in each Presidency speak of the crime.

The *Hindu Patriot* is the recognised representative of the well-to-do section of the educated natives of Bengal; the *Indian Mirror* of the younger and more advanced generation. The *Hindu Patriot* describes the murders as a "shocking and fiendish outrage." But it asks for a calm investigation, and protests against the panic-haste to identify large classes with a crime which may have been an act of individual ferocity. We must remember that two days before, at the opposite extremity of India, a similar murder took place. While the Deputy-Commissioner of

Peshawar and his chief clerk were driving home from the Jubilee preparations on the 20th of June, a Mussulman shot at them at so close a range as to burn their clothes. The chief clerk, Mr. Ross, died in the evening. The assassin was a Ghazi from a Pathan village, who had deliberately made up his mind to obtain martyrdom by the slaughter of an infidel. The crime is one with which we are familiar when committed by a Mussulman fanatic in Northern India, under the promptings of uncontrolled religious fervour. The Indian Government has long since given up the idea of saddling any large class of its Mussulman subjects with the responsibility for such a deed. Our Simla Correspondent simply telegraphed that "a case of Ghazi-ism occurred at Peshawar yesterday." The *Hindu Patriot* asks that we should deal in an equally just spirit with the "shocking and fiendish outrage at Poona," until such evidence of class co-operation is obtained as would satisfy an impartial judge.

The *Indian Mirror*, the organ of the advanced section of educated Bengalis, takes a more vivid view of the crime. "The news of the ghastly tragedy that has just been enacted at Poona," it writes, "will have been received everywhere with feelings of horror. The crime admits of no palliation, and its authors are entitled to no mercy." But the *Indian Mirror*, while accepting the statement that some of the Marathi vernacular papers have allowed their protests against the drastic plague measures to reach the point of disaffection, points out the injustice of accusing the whole Maratha people with disloyalty. "It has yet to be proved that the criminals are Maratha Hindus"—a point which can be settled "only by a full and open investigation."

Among the Bombay papers the *Indian Spectator* represents the social and the *Champion* the political party of reform. Both have spoken out firmly and frankly in condemnation of the crime. But even the loyal editor of the *Spectator*, Mr. Malabari, while denouncing the assassins and their cruel and stupid revenge, protests against the hasty assumption of certain Anglo-Indian journals that it was prompted not by individual ferocity but by class disaffection. The condemnation of the deed by the *Champion*, which represents the most advanced party of the educated Indians in Bombay, is equally severe. One paper, however, the *Rast-Gofar*, takes the conspiracy-view of the occurrence. "The only thing that is now desired on all hands," it writes, "is that the murderer or murderers of Lieutenant Ayerst be apprehended and brought to justice without loss of time. There is no longer any mystery as to the motive which inspired the foul deed. It is quite clear as daylight that the assassins sought the blood of those who, they thought, carried out the segregation operations in the city with oppressive severity." This feeling "was the result," the *Rast-Gofar* goes on to say, "of inflammable writings which appeared in the Deccan papers for some time past against plague officials." It thus comes back to the two causes from which we started—the irreconcilable conflict between ancient caste restrictions and the imperative demands of modern science, worked up to a climax by excited articles in certain of the native papers.

The leading native journals in Madras take practically the same view as those in Bengal—condemnation of the deed and a demand for a full and fair enquiry before the guilt is shifted from individuals to a class. "The news of the outrage at Poona," says the *Hindu*, "will be received everywhere with the utmost sorrow and with no little indignation. . . . Assassination, it has been well said, never changed the course of history even when it had a ruling Sovereign for its victim, and he must have been a madman indeed who thought that by killing Mr. Rand any political object could be gained or any grievance redressed. We have to make this remark because some of the Anglo-Indian papers are trying to connect the intellectual Brahmins of Poona with this most cowardly outrage. Whether the Poona Brahmins were or were not implicated in the affair is a question which must be decided by the proper tribunals and not by prejudiced Anglo-Indian scribes. The attempt to make political capital out of this incident is as cowardly as the assassination itself. . . . Our sympathies are all with the unfortunate victims, and we abhor the unspeakable atrocity of the deed. It is an un-Hindu deed, and one which will call forth the execration of the whole civilised world." "When we last wrote on the subject," says the other leading native paper of South-Eastern India, the *Madras Standard*, "we condemned it as a dastardly act planned and executed by some black characters, and attributed the crime to the bad feeling created by the strict carrying out of the plague regulations." It again insists on this view, and, while admitting that there had been a good deal of strong writing in the Deccan journals, it denies the likelihood of any connexion with a class conspiracy. Two sentences may be taken as summing up its conclusions. "We of course admit that the tragedy itself should not be classed with common cases of murder. It is something more than that; but it has no political significance."

The foregoing extracts may be taken to represent the views of the English educated classes of Indians in the three presidencies. But, after all, the English-speaking natives are but a handful compared with the 280 millions who do their life's hard labour and never see a newspaper. The opinion of this great solid mass would probably be that the plague measures were a cruel interference with their religious obligations and domestic life, but that it was the will of the Government, and so must be obeyed. Nor do our extracts touch the vernacular press. But it is right that the British nation should understand the attitude of the class who are accustomed to express their opinions on political subjects. We may be sure that the Government of India will get at the truth, and that if there was anything approaching to a class conspiracy it will be dragged to light. Till then the crime stands in the same category as the assassination two days previously at Peshawar, and of the Mussulman riots in Calcutta—a crime prompted partly by religious or caste fanaticism, partly by lawless ferocity; one of a series in the long conflict between Indian traditions and Western civilisation.—"Indian Affairs," July 26.

THE POONA ASSASSINATIONS.

A CASE FOR JUDICIAL ENQUIRY.

I.—JOINT MEMORIAL OF HINDUS AND MUHAMMADANS.

The following is the text of the joint memorial signed by 2,000 Hindus and Muhammadans of Poona, and forwarded to the Government of Bombay by the Presidents of the leading Hindu and Muhammadan associations of the Deccan. We print the text of the memorial first, and, after it, the covering letter to the Secretary to the Government of Bombay.

It may be added that on July 26, too late for inclusion in the present issue of INDIA, we received from the Deccan Sabha at Poona copies of the appendices referred to in the memorial. These appendices, which we have examined, contain under each head of the allegations the statements of individuals, whose names and addresses are given. Judicial enquiry can alone deal satisfactorily with this categorical statement of substantial grievances:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable William Baron Sandhurst, G.C.I.E., Governor and President in Council.

May it please your Excellency,—The undersigned inhabitants of Poona beg most respectfully to submit for the consideration of Government that for the last eight weeks they have been subjected to a reign of terror, due to the irregular and oppressive high-handedness of the special agency employed by Plague Committee for the inspection, fumigation, and lime-washing of houses, for searching out plague patients, and for the segregation of healthy persons. We have but little fault to find with the rules made by the Plague Committee under orders of Government, but unfortunately, owing to the nature of the special agency employed, these rules are often violated, and when parties injured apply for redress to the Committee, they fail to find it.

The complaints of oppression and irregularity were lately represented on our behalf by the Deccan Sabha and the Anjuman Association, but the letter addressed in that behalf received no other reply than that "the representation has been considered by the Committee." Meanwhile there has been no change in the methods followed by the search and fumigation parties. We have been therefore compelled to submit this representation to Government, and we request that Government will be pleased to take such steps as they may deem necessary to remove all causes of complaint by adopting the several suggestions made on our behalf in the letter addressed to the Committee by the Deccan Sabha and the Anjuman Association.

In substantiation of the complaints made, we have authorised the associations above named to append to this petition certain statements made and signed by the parties aggrieved, which will serve as samples of many more similar acts of oppression from which we suffer. We shall mention some of the principal points to which these complaints relate:—

(a) People are often sent to the plague hospital without a proper medical examination being previously made to satisfy the authorities that the persons removed are suffering from plague. As some instances of this complaint, we beg to request Government to refer to statements marked a in the appendix.

(b) Relatives and neighbours of plague patients, and even passers-by, are at once hurried to the segregation camp, with-

out being allowed time to make proper arrangements for the custody of the property in their houses. As instances of this irregular procedure, we refer to the statements marked *b*.

(c) In the inspection of inmates of houses sometimes persons are subjected to the indignity of being forced to remove all the clothes from their bodies in the presence of the members of the search parties and other people. We refer to the statements marked *c*.

(d) The native gentlemen who volunteered to accompany search parties, and were appointed by the Committee to that duty, are slighted, and their suggestions are disregarded. In support of this, we beg that reference may be made to these gentlemen, who, feeling that they are not properly trusted, decline to accompany the search parties.

(e) In the inspection of houses no respect is shown to the religious sentiments of natives, in regard to the sanctity of the kitchen and of rooms where worship is offered. In some cases the idols in Hindu temples have been polluted. We refer to the statements marked *e*.

(f) Notwithstanding the injunctions of the Committee in that behalf, much mischief is done in regard of property in burning or destroying, though the rules of the Committee require that only the bedding and the clothing of the deceased should be burnt. As instances we refer to the statements marked *f*.

(g) Persons occupying houses are threatened, and in some cases assaulted, when they remonstrate against the procedure followed by the search parties in the matter of forcibly opening locks and destroying property. Instances will be found in the statements marked *g*.

(h) In a few cases the modesty of native ladies has not been respected. We refer to the statements marked *h*.

(i) Complaints were made to the Committee, but the persons injured have failed to obtain redress. The parties injured have no means of finding out the names of the soldiers who misbehave, and who thus bring discredit on the whole body. It may be that all the members of the search and other parties do not misuse the power conferred on them, but it is not possible to find out the names of such as do misconduct themselves or to identify them.

In these and many other ways the whole town is virtually treated as if the men employed in the inspection and other work were absolute masters of the person and property of the inhabitants, and that for the time the protection of law was withdrawn from them. Such a state of things has driven away thousands of the population from the city and those who cannot afford to go out feel that to the horrors of plague and famine from which they are suffering a worse terror has been added which leaves them no peace of mind either by day or by night. Since British rule commenced, the people of this city have never had such experience, and they accordingly pray that, as suggested on their behalf by their leading associations, Government will take steps and relieve them from their present anxieties and sufferings. We do not object to the inspection of houses for finding out plague cases, or to the removal of patients to the hospital, or to the segregation of healthy persons; but we request that the agency and methods employed in Bombay may be followed in Poona.

And for this act of kindness we shall as in duty bound ever pray.

To John Decourcy Atkins, J.C.S., Secretary to Government General Department.

Sir,—We beg to forward herewith a petition for the consideration of Government, signed by nearly 2,000 inhabitants of the city, complaining of certain irregular and oppressive proceedings of some members of the agency at present employed for the inspection, fumigation, and lime-washing of houses, for searching out plague patients, and for the segregation of healthy persons. We append, also, copies of letters addressed by our Association to the Plague Committee, and the replies received thereto. Attached to the petition are statements, each duly signed, showing particulars under different heads of the cases in which complaints have been made. Such statements could be multiplied to any extent, but only a few of them under each head, which admit of easy verification, have been appended. As the replies received from the Committee will show that they are either not disposed to give

redress, or that even if they were so disposed they are unable to secure on the part of the different parties engaged in the work the observance of their own rules, we request that Government will be pleased, in view of these complaints and the panic and demoralisation which they indicate, to take such steps as they may deem necessary to substitute, in place of the agency at present employed, such other agency as will be more amenable to control, on the plan followed in Bombay with such success. For a fuller statement of our reasons we beg to refer Government to our second letter to the chairman of the Poona Plague Committee, where we have suggested this change.

We also beg to point out to Government that the inspection of villages by British soldiers is wholly uncalled for, inasmuch as the district statistics do not show that villages around Poona have been affected by the plague. Only a few cases were reported in two or three villages, but these were imported from affected parts, and as such do not warrant the subjection of all villages about Poona to the stringent operations of the Plague Committee. The panic and the other evils that were the direct result of the plague operations in the city would be far more disastrous in the villages. We would therefore suggest that the duty of inspecting the villages should be entrusted to the Mamlatdars and the village doctors.

Lastly, we have to request that Government will be pleased to order the immediate discontinuance of the night searches in suspected houses by soldiers, which have been recently instituted. Such searches lead to great abuses, without their yielding any good results.—We have the honour to remain, Sir, your most obedient servants,

VISHNOO MOKESHBH BHIDE, President Deccan Sabha.

ABDUL FEROKHMAN, President Anjuman Association.

KOOPCOOSWAMY MUDLIAR, Sirdar, Deccan.

HARI NARAYAN APTE, Honorary Secretary Deccan Sabha.

Deccan Sabha Rooms, Poona, May 10, 1897.

On July 26 we received the following telegram from an esteemed correspondent in Bombay:

"Memorial 10th May sent, as stated by Lord George Hamilton, on 21st May. Collecting signatures. But on the 20th April similar memorial was sent to Mr. Rand. Memorial 10th May was sent to Lord Sandhurst because Mr. Rand gave unsatisfactory reply. Has Lord Sandhurst seen first memorial? Two memorials causing confusion."

A Poona correspondent writes, under date July 8:

"The appendices accompanying the memorial of the Deccan Sabha and of the Anjuman-i-Islam were forwarded to Government on 10 May last in original, and up to this time no enquiry to our knowledge and in the presence of the complainants has been made, nor has any reply been up to this day vouchsafed to the memorialists. The signatories to the appendices are respectable men, and we have every confidence that the complaints were made in good faith.

"The English abstracts of the original appendices (which were in Marathi) have been sent by the mail, which takes this letter. The complaints forming the appendices are only a few out of hundreds made to the Poona Plague Committee by the people. All these are doubtless on the Committee's files.

"Government within a week of the lamentable murders of Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand has imposed a punitive police on the Poona city for

two years, costing nearly three lacs of rupees. The murders were apparently the work of a few miscreants, for whose misdeeds the whole city is to be punished. Government promises soon to specify the section or sections of the populace from whom the cost will be recovered.

"Up to the present Government does not know who have committed the murders. Notwithstanding this they have pronounced judgment and inflicted sentence."

A Bombay correspondent writes under date, July 9:—

"I want to put you on your guard about the Poona business, sensational telegrams about which have evidently been wired home. I have seen a number of the Poona leaders, including Mr. Tilak, and I have read with care the papers charged with sedition. I have also seen the memorials sent to the Government by the Deccan Sabha. (i) As to the leaders of the people; they know as much about the outrage as you do, and they are as distressed as any honest man should be in consequence of the murders of Lieut. Ayerst and Mr. Rand: (ii) As to the papers charged with sedition; all their complaints are directed against the Plague Committee, not against the central Government, and surely it is not seditious to complain concerning a public committee, even though it be appointed by a Government and officered by its officials? and (3) the memorials contain serious charges against the soldiers who visited the houses of the people when searching for plague cases. These charges are made over the signatures of respectable Hindu and Mussulman gentlemen, and the Government merely, in answering (an answer after two or three days' consideration) say, 'your memorial has been recorded.' Further Pandita Ramabai (you must know of her) has brought definite charges against the Plague Administration. These charges appeared in a public letter written in May last, and, with our present knowledge, one wonders why no notice was taken of this lady's statement. As to the punitive force in Poona, the municipality have no funds. Plague and famine have depleted their treasury. We here are quite in the dark as to the motives or reasons which prompted the Government to take this foolish and cruel step. However, I think the storm of rage will blow over. Already the Anglo-Indian press are moderating their language, and I think they are a little ashamed of their outburst. Could not there be an enquiry into the whole plague administration of Poona?"

II.—THE "FULL REPLY" OF THE BOMBAY GOVERNMENT.

On July 5, Lord George Hamilton read in the House of Commons, amid loud cheers, what he described as a "full reply" from Lord Sandhurst to the Poona memorial of May 10. In the present temper of the House of Commons it is easy to provoke cheers from Tory members below the gangway, and Lord Sandhurst's reply proves on analysis to be considerably less "full" than Lord G. Hamilton's excited hearers were ready to think.

The reply, which is given at length in our Parliamentary report, may be analysed thus:—

ALLEGATION OF POONA MEMORIAL.

(a) People were often sent to the plague hospital without proper medical examination;

(b) Relatives and neighbours of plague patients were hurried to the segregation camp;

(c) Inmates of houses were subjected to indignity in inspection;

(d) Native volunteers, being alighted, refused to accompany search parties;

(e) Religious sentiments were offended by pollution of kitchens, and places of worship;

(f) Property was, contrary to rule, destroyed or burnt;

(g) Inmates of houses were threatened or assaulted when they remonstrated against forcible opening of locks, and destruction of property;

(h) In a few cases modesty of native ladies was not respected;

(i) Complaints were made in vain, and no means of finding out the names of the offenders.

REPLY OF LORD SANDHURST.

People were not so sent.

The greatest care was taken.

I have not heard of any allegations of indignity being substantiated.

Native volunteers accompanied search parties to the very end.

Search parties were instructed to have regard to religious feelings.

Special care was taken to avoid needless destruction.

No unnecessary violence was used in entering houses.

I do not believe the possibility of indignity to native women.

Officers were in plentiful attendance, and it was made known that complaints should be made to them.

Is this a "full reply"? It seems to us to be a point-blank denial of the allegations, and little more. There is, of course, no question as to the instructions given. The point of the memorial is that the instructions were disobeyed. Lord Sandhurst, as we remark elsewhere, has won golden opinions in Bombay as a just and sympathetic Governor, and no human being will question his word. But we submit, with great respect, that in this matter expressions of personal opinion (as distinguished from actual knowledge) are as little conclusive as references to orders which are alleged to have been broken. As for the answer to allegation (i) we refer our readers to the statement of the *Times of India* which we print in "Indiana."

Lord George Hamilton says that he telegraphed to Bombay for "a categorical reply to each series of accusations." Now, obviously a reply is of little value if it is not based upon enquiry. Upon what sort of enquiry, we ask, was Lord Sandhurst's reply based? It is hard to say, because ten days later (July 15) Lord G. Hamilton said (i) that on receipt of the Poona memorial the Bombay Government desired Mr. Rand to report upon it; (ii) that the reply of the Government was postponed until his report should be received; and (iii) that the report was still incomplete at the time of his murder and consequently no reply had yet (July 15) been given.

It is plain, therefore, that the Government of Bombay had not a complete report from Mr. Rand upon which to base the "full reply" read to the House of Commons by Lord G. Hamilton.

But did they make special and full enquiry on receipt of Lord G. Hamilton's telegram asking for "a categorical reply?" This again can hardly have

been the case. The dates here are important. It was on July 1 that Sir W. Wedderburn called Lord G. Hamilton's attention to the Poona memorial, and until that time (see Parliamentary report) Lord G. Hamilton had not seen a copy. Four days later (July 5) he read out Lord Sandhurst's reply, having telegraphed to him after seeing the memorial. Lord Sandhurst's reply is dated July 4. On an outside estimate, therefore, there were only three days in which enquiry could be made. Will it be suggested that full enquiry into the Poona allegations could be made, and was actually made, between July 1 and July 4? If not, upon what sort of knowledge was the "full reply" of the Bombay Government based?

These considerations serve, we think, to emphasise the demand for a full judicial enquiry.

III.—THE ATTACK ON PROFESSOR GOKHALE.

If the question asked by Sir J. Fergusson in the House of Commons on July 13 were to convey the impression that Professor Gokhale (an accomplished Indian gentleman, whose reputation cannot be impaired by scurrilous and anonymous scribbles in the *Times*) had originated the allegation that two women were violated by British soldiers employed on plague duty in Poona, the impression would be totally wrong. What Professor Gokhale said, in an "interview" reported in the *Manchester Guardian* on July 2, was:—

"My correspondents, whose word I can trust absolutely, report the violation of two women, one of whom is said afterwards to have committed suicide rather than survive her shame."

The following letter from Professor Gokhale was printed in the *Manchester Guardian* of July 15:—

To the Editor of the MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.

Sir,—With reference to the questions asked yesterday in the House of Commons about a statement contained in the report of the interview which your representative had with me some time back, I hope you will allow me to say a word. Sir James Fergusson's question reads as though he thought that the allegation of the violations originated with me. The facts, however, are these. In the month of May last I received several letters from Poona from different individuals complaining bitterly, among other things, of the violation of two women (one of whom was reported by one correspondent to have subsequently committed suicide). Among these letters there were two from two friends whom I have known for years, and who are incapable of consciously misleading me. They not only corroborated the allegation about the violation, but gave me some particulars about one of the two women. I have shown these two letters to some of my English friends. The alleged outrages were also referred to and commented upon in severe terms in some of the vernacular papers, copies of which were sent me. I mentioned all these facts to your representative, and he has reported me correctly.

I see from a Renter's telegram that the Bombay Government have directed Mr. Lamb to enquire into the allegations. Under these circumstances, is it not rather premature that Lord Sandhurst should stigmatise them as a malevolent invention? I do not say that because these allegations are made, therefore they are necessarily true. But I think they ought to have been promptly enquired into at the time when they were first made in Poona, so as to prevent a general belief in native circles that there was some foundation for them.—I am, etc.,

G. K. GOKHALE.

28, Gauden Road, Clapham, July 14, 1897.

Sir W. Wedderburn and the writer of the interview both stated—one in the *Times*, the other in the

Manchester Guardian—that they had seen some of the letters referred to.

As Professor Gokhale left London en route for Bombay on Friday, July 16, he could not possibly reply at once to attacks made upon him in London newspapers subsequent to that date.

Two abusive and grotesquely inaccurate letters, signed "Scrutator," appeared in the *Times* of July 17 and July 23.

The following incorrect statement, in a tissue of incorrect statements, appeared in the letter of July 23:

"Mr. Gokhale was the bearer of the memorial to which Sir William refers, truly dated May 10th last . . . and he also brought over a variety of other documents dealing with similar allegations."

We can affirm from personal knowledge that this statement is absolutely false. Professor Gokhale left Poona on March 5, being deputed to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. As he is joint secretary of the Deccan Sabha, a copy of the memorial of May 10 was forwarded to him by his colleague, Mr. Apte, one of the signatories of the memorial, for his information. This document and the newspapers and letters referred to were received by Mr. Gokhale in London some time after his arrival.

IV.—SIR W. WEDDERBURN'S LETTERS TO THE "TIMES."

The following letter to the Editor appeared in the *Times* of July 8:—

Sir,—In to-day's issue you refer to the telegram from Lord Sandhurst as an emphatic repudiation of the charges contained in the Poona memorial of the 10th of May, adding that it is open to me and my friends to impugn the credibility of the statements made by the Bombay Government. All that I have hitherto done in the matter of this memorial has been to ask Lord George Hamilton whether he has received a copy of it; whether enquiry has been made into the truth of the allegations contained therein; and what answer was given to the prayer of the petitioners, the prayer being that the system followed in Bombay should also be followed in Poona. I propose to show that from the circumstances of the case I was justified in asking these questions, to the two latter of which I have as yet received no answer.

No one denies the genuineness of the memorial, and the known facts regarding it are as follows:

1. Two thousand Hindus and Muhammadans of Poona, acting jointly, presented this memorial, couched in moderate terms, to the Government of Bombay complaining of ill-treatment and oppression.

2. To the memorial was added an appendix containing specific charges signed by the parties aggrieved; and

3. The memorial was forwarded to the Government by the presidents of the leading Hindu and Muhammadan Associations of the Deccan.

With regard to these facts I have the following observations to make:—For the last three or four years the relations between the Hindu and Muham-

madan communities in Poona have been much strained. When, therefore, we find them acting jointly, it is a matter of no small significance, and seems to indicate that there must have been some substantial grievance common to both communities. Then as regards the persons who signed the memorial. The first name is that of Mr. Bhide, president of the Deccan Sabha. I have known this gentleman well for some 25 years, and he bears the very highest character for independence and uprightness. He is now 70 years old, and, after serving Government in high judicial offices for about 40 years, he has retired on the *maximum* pension allowed by the regulations. He is the head in Poona of the moderate party which advocates social as well as political reform, and regards the stability of British rule as the basis of all its hopes. It is simply absurd to suppose that he would have engaged in a conspiracy to bring false and malicious complaints against the authorities. Similarly as regards Mr. Mudliar, another signatory, who is one of the wealthiest men in Poona, who is well known in Anglo-Indian society, and who has recently been raised to the rank of First Class Sirdar, that being the highest grade among the Deccan nobility. A memorial making definite allegations, and vouched for by gentlemen of such a position, was clearly entitled to careful attention and enquiry.

Also it is to be noted that the complaints regarding Poona plague administration were not confined to extreme journals or to those published at Poona. Take, for example, so moderate a paper as the *Indian Spectator*, published at Bombay, and edited by Mr. Malabari, the well-known social reformer. This is what he says in his issue of May 30 with regard to the employment of European soldiers in house visitations at Poona:—

“While General Gatscere and his colleagues may well claim to have given an object-lesson in administration by very nearly succeeding in reconciling people, by means of patience, tact, and conciliation, even to measures for which they have an inborn dislike, the Poona Plague Committee seemed to do things, from beginning to end, in a manner in which they ought never to have been done. The unwisdom of intrusting the delicate and responsible business of house-to-house visitations to soldiers, and of turning a deaf ear even to verified complaints of wanton damage to property and of injury to body and mind, is now pretty well known.”

Looking to these considerations I again repeat my questions, What enquiry was made into the allegations in the memorial, and what reply was given to the memorialists?

I have, etc.,

W. WEDDERBURN.

House of Commons, July 6.

The following letter, dated July 14, appeared in the *Times* of July 17:—

To the Editor of the *Times*.

Sir,—As I was not present in the House at question time yesterday, when (on private notice) some enquiries were made regarding Professor Gokhale and the statements put forward by him respecting the plague at Poona, perhaps you will allow me to state that he is a professor at the Fergusson College at Poona, and was one of the four representative

Indian witnesses delegated to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. I have known him for many years, and can state that he bears the highest character for integrity; and his public spirit is shown by the fact that he and his colleagues, who are life members of the college, have voluntarily devoted twenty years of their lives, on a mere pittance, to the cause of education. As he had recently come from Poona, I invited the members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee to meet him and the other Indian witnesses in the conference room of the House, and he then stated what he knew about the plague administration. As regards the violation of women, what he said was that he had received private letters from friends whose word he could trust absolutely, in which the allegation was contained. Further than this he did not go, and in this statement he was certainly correct, as he showed me some of the letters. That the belief was generally prevalent in Poona is shown by similar allegations which appeared at the time in the vernacular Press; and the important question is: What enquiry was made by the authorities at the time regarding these allegations? The Government were clearly put upon enquiry by the responsible memorial of the 10th of May, signed by 2,000 Hindus and Muhammadans of Poona, in which it was stated that in a few cases the modesty of native ladies was not respected. In support of this allegation statements made and signed by the parties aggrieved seem to have been appended to the memorial; but, from information I have received by telegraph, it appears that no enquiry was made upon this memorial, and that no reply was given to the memorialists. Until enquiry is made, the truth or otherwise of these serious allegations cannot be ascertained. If the allegations are shown to be false, by all means let punishment be awarded. The Indian Penal Code makes ample provision for such cases. All I desire is that full enquiry should be made, and that the truth should be known.

I have, etc.,

W. WEDDERBURN.

House of Commons, July 14.

V.—REPORTED OUTRAGES ON NATIVE WOMEN.

The following question, which was too late to be reported in our Parliamentary Supplement, was asked in the House of Commons on Monday, July 26:—

Major RANCH asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a paragraph in the *Daily News* of Thursday last embodying a statement from the secretary of the Indian Association to the following effect:—“Two gross cases are reported of attempted outrage on Hindu girls in the Khana plague inspection camp by two European officers, who have been suspended by the Government. Pandita Ramabai writes to a newspaper of the seduction of one of her girls in the Poona plague camp, utterly demoralising the arrangements there. These cases have created a great sensation all over the country”; and whether there was any truth in either allegation.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The allegations alluded to consisted of two charges—one in connexion with a segregation camp at Khana, in Bengal, for the detention of railway passengers, and the other in connexion with the late plague camp in Poona. I have received the following reports upon them:—“Lieutenant-

Governor of Bengal reports that police-sergeant and military assistant-surgeon were charged with making immoral overtures to two Hindu circus girls and a Japanese prostitute in segregation huts at Khana plague inspection camp. Japanese consented, and left with police-officer; circus girls declined, and, on assistant-surgeon pressing, one of them raised alarm. Police-officer dismissed; assistant-surgeon suspended. His case being further investigated. Both are of European parentage; police-sergeant born and domiciled in India." As regards the second case, the Governor of Bombay telegraphs:—"Pandita Ramabai's assertions had attracted my notice, and I enquired into them early in June. The girl she mentions was not seduced in the plague camp. She was a plague patient, and was discharged cured. What became of her afterwards is not known. The assertion about utterly demoralising the arrangements in Poona camp absolutely untrue. From first to last somewhere about 500 female patients were admitted; nearly all had relatives or friends attending them; no complaints of violated modesty were ever made. Officer in charge saw Pandita Ramabai herself on several occasions in the hospital, but she never made any complaint to him."

In this connexion it may be of interest to add the following telegram, which was printed in the *Daily Telegraph* of Friday, July 23, under the headings: "Reported Outrages on Native Women. A Ridiculous Story":—

FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.

BOMBAY, Thursday.

An extraordinary story has appeared in the *Bangobasi*, a disreputable paper which is published at Chandernagor, in French territory, and which the British Post Office authorities refuse to allow to pass through the mails.

In the course of this narrative it is alleged that two Bengali circus-riders were ordered to descend from the train at Khana, and that a young doctor and a hospital assistant invited them home. On the women's refusal, the doctor is stated to have ordered them to the observation camp, where an attempt was made to assault them.

It is added that the screams of the women attracted attention, with the result that they were rescued.

The whole story is perfectly ridiculous, as these circus girls belong to a notorious class.

On the following day, however—Saturday, July 24—the *Daily Telegraph* printed the following:—

FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.

BOMBAY, Friday.

The Governor of Bengal has ordered an enquiry to be instituted into the Khana case, and meanwhile the assistant-surgeon, a subordinate in the Medical Service, and a sergeant of Railway Police have been suspended.

Notwithstanding this, the native Press accuse the Government of hushing up the affair.

The private secretary to the Governor writes that the authorities took action on an allegation current in the Anurita Bazaar at Calcutta. A native paper says that the story is more like a romance than a reality, for it cannot conceive the sergeant acting in the way in which he is reported to have done with so many people close by, and considering other circumstances.

In view of Lord G. Hamilton's answer to Major Rasch, the following extract from the editorial columns of the *Daily Telegraph* (July 23) possesses a certain interest:—

One of our morning contemporaries yesterday gave currency to a ridiculous story. It was reported on the strength of a telegram from the Secretary of the India Association that two gross cases of attempted outrage on Hindu girls had occurred in the Khana plague inspection camp, and that the offenders—two European officers—had in consequence been suspended by the Government. On every ground it is to be regretted that responsible London journals should lend themselves to the propagation of rumours like these, especially under the present circumstances, when every breath of suspicion is made use of to attack our administration in India and suggest the incompetence, if not the utter worthlessness, of English officials.

VI.—LETTER FROM PANDITA RAMABAI.

The following is the text of Pandita Ramabai's letter dated May 18, to the *Bombay Guardian*, which was referred to by Lord George Hamilton in his answer to Major Rasch in the House of Commons on July 26, with reference to the plague operations at Poona. Pandita Ramabai—an accomplished Christian lady—is so well known to the religious and philanthropic public in the United Kingdom that anything which she says on such a subject is likely to receive attention:—

DEAR GUARDIAN,—I have come here to live in the Plague Hospital, but am safe and sound, thank God. I have come here to take care of one of my babies, who was sent here by order of the doctor on plague duty on the railway station. I dare not send anyone else to this dangerous place. It is a truly dangerous place, though it looks all nice and clean as far as the hospital arrangements are concerned. There are so many doctors and nurses and servants to look after the patients here, but the internal state of affairs is questionable. The higher authorities do not know much about it, I suppose. Some of the doctors on plague duty act very strangely on the railway stations.

A young man was sent here last night. He is as fat and healthy-looking as anyone can be, but he is living here because he was sent here by the doctor. One day when I was taking my girls from Talegaum to Kedgaum, the doctor on duty examined all the girls in the train. One of the girls was very ill from the effects of heat and hardships which she had to bear at Talegaum. The doctor let her go, but made another girl who had nothing the matter with her to get down from the railway carriage and frightened her out of her wits. She got very much excited and began to cry. After examining her the doctor was obliged to let her go as she had no fever. Yesterday, however, the same doctor I think found a little child in a party of our girls who returned home from Kedgaum. The child is suffering from itch. She is a famine baby and had slight fever. He ordered us to send her at once to the plague hospital. This morning she had no fever, but the surgeon says we have to stop here for two or three days. However, this is not a matter of grief to me.

About two months ago, when Mr. Plunkett paid his first visit to my school, some famine girls were suffering from various diseases, such as itch, mumps, disorder of the stomach, etc. Mr. Plunkett told me to send all the girls to the Sassoon Hospital, even though they should not have much to suffer from. He assured me at the same time that all the girls would be safe and well taken care of at the Hospital. So I sent many of my girls there, and most of them returned home soon. One of those girls, a famine widow, had strong fever on her. She was taken for a plague case, and was sent to this Plague Hospital. We were told that none of us would be allowed to come here unless we stayed as long as the doctors thought fit. I could send no one to take care of the poor girl, and could not come myself, as I had to look after 180 girls, and remove them from Poona at the order of the magistrate.

By the time I had a little time to come to Poona and make enquiries, nearly six weeks had elapsed; and when I enquired for her at the Sassoon Hospital on last Saturday, the surgeon informed me that the girl had died long ago. Would to God she had died instead of living as she lives now. After my arrival here last night I enquired for her, and found out that she was well and living here. I desired to see her, but this morning I was told by the servant and watchman that the girl was "kept" by a watchman of this Hospital. This man says she has gone away, he does not know where. Two medical practitioners and two women servants told me last night that the girl was well, and I should see her this morning. The same persons change their word this morning, and say she is not here; she was discharged some time ago, and "they did not feel bound to inform me of her discharge from the hospital." Strange management is this. Now the girl is gone to the devil, lost, lost for ever! O dreadful thought! My heart aches for her, for she was a good child. I wished I had died before anything of this kind had happened to one of my girls. I owe all this grief and other troubles to the Poona city authorities. God knows how many young girls of good character have been separated from their friends in this

way and was obliged to go to the Plague Hospital and Segregation Camp and be ruined and lost for ever. The Lord knows how many heart-broken mothers are weeping for their lost children. The City Magistrate with other people living in style, know little and care less for the hundreds of poor unfortunate victims of their careless rule.

The sahibs and memsahibs occasionally visiting segregation camps are very pleased with the outside cleanliness of these places. They seem to think that we poor "natives" do not suffer from heat and other inconvenience. There are no proper bathrooms and resting places here. The people who come here to take care of their sick friends have to suffer much. I had to lie down in the open ground all night. The pricking stones, bugs, mosquitoes, and fleas made it impossible for me to go to sleep. They told me to sleep in the ward, a miserable shed with five beds in it. One patient who looks very much like a plague-stricken woman is lying down on a *charpai*. She vomits very often; my little child is obliged to be next to her. Her son slept on the ground near her *charpai*, and I was told to sleep near the child, about six feet apart from him. What do you think of this? I suppose the hospital authorities think that Indian women are lost to all sense of shame and propriety. I have to be baking here in the heat and must write, for I have much writing to do. The surgeon told me I had bad eyes, and must take care of them. I requested him to let me go into a separate room with my child where I could have a little shaded place. He kindly consented to let me go into a vacant ward, but I hear now that it had been occupied by plague-stricken people. I must choose between either have my eyes blinded by the sun, have sunstroke or headache, or consent to breathe in the plague germs by going into the ward formerly occupied by plague patients. The filthiness of the only bathroom assigned for women living here is indescribable. Women who come here to take care of their sick relations, must give up all modesty or suffer pains. Never before have I felt so mortified and put to shame, but now this evil has come on me, and I have to thank the city authorities for it. I am writing this with my sore eyes to warn parents and friends of young women against the moral evils of the plague hospitals and segregation camps, that their young women are never safe in these dreadful places. Some of my girls offered to come and stay here to take care of the child, and now I am glad I did not allow them to come here. I shall never let a girl come alone to this dreadful place while I have a little strength in me. God help the young women who may be obliged to come to such a place as this, and may He open the eyes of our city magistrate and his colleagues to see the evils resulting from their heartless, unjust rule. I am mourning over my lost child as much as ever a mother mourned, and wish death had put an end to all this. May mothers protect their girl-children, even though it may be at the cost of their own lives.

Believe me,

Yours in the Lord's service.

RAMABAI.

Government Plague Hospital, Poona,
May 18th, 1897.

VII.—THE NATIVE PRESS.

"There can," said the writer of "Indian Affairs" in the *Times* of July 26, "be no question as to the genuine reprobation with which the news of the tragedy has been condemned by the leading members of the native press;" and, in an admirable article, the writer proceeded to "summarise the terms in which the acknowledged organs of Indian opinion in each Presidency speak of the crime." In view of the demand which is still being made (though less vehemently than three weeks ago) for special restrictions upon the press in India, it may be interesting to quote two authoritative opinions upon the subject. Sir William Markby wrote to the *Spectator* of July 17 last:

"I should like to add one word on behalf of the native Indian press, which is, I think, just now getting more abuse

than it deserves. I have for years read regularly extracts from a large number of native newspapers. The criticisms I have met with are sometimes severe, but for the most part respectful. There is occasionally strong 'disapprobation,' but very rarely 'disaffection.'"

And here is what Sir Richard Garth, Q.C. (late Chief Justice in Bengal), wrote in the *Law Magazine and Review* for February, 1895:

"I can only say I read native papers myself week after week, and never see anything there at all approaching sedition or even disloyalty or disrespect to English rule. What I do find there, and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many of the Government officials. I am afraid this is exactly what the Government would wish to repress. I consider it a most wholesome and salutary means of bringing the misconduct of Government officers to the notice not only of the Indian people but of the Courts of Justice."

We take the following passage from a notable sermon preached by the Bishop of Bombay, at St. Paul's Church, Poona, on Sunday, June 27:—

At a time like this it behoves us to be specially watchful of ourselves. To say nothing of anything higher, how much is at stake at such a time; how much of our character for humanity, how much of the confidence in our justice—which after all is what keeps India peaceful. It is impossible to go about Poona and not be convinced of two things; first, who-soever and many-soever the guilty persons may be, still the bulk of our Indian neighbours are just as much horrified and distressed as we, whose fellow-countrymen have been attacked. Nothing, therefore, could be more unjust than to lump all Natives together in our loathing for those who are guilty. And, next, the uneducated may believe us to be capable as a body of exacting indiscriminate vengeance for the crime of which some have been guilty. As I look at the shamed, cowed groups which have gathered at the corners of the streets and look askance at European passers-by, I have read in the glances that they cast no hatred, racial or otherwise, no glorying in that which had been done, but first an appalled sense of shame that such things should have been done on their behalf, and, secondly, a feeling of uneasiness as to what may ensue to the community as the consequence of guilt in a few. And I have thought, as I read this last, is it possible that they know us so little? After all these years of our rule, do they suppose us capable to-day of letting loose a military vengeance, indiscriminately for the shedding of Christian blood.

VIII.—SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

We add a selection of extracts from the numerous articles which have appeared in British newspapers of all shades of opinion:—

WANTED: ENQUIRY BY A PROPER BODY.

There are two ways of looking at an event like this. The one is to make up one's mind at the outset that the Indian Government is a bureaucracy manned and served by angels, so that there can be no question of the wisdom of its way of stamping out the plague, or of the perfect delicacy, judgment, and self-restraint with which the work is carried out by British soldiers. The other way is to start with the assumption that British officials in India can err like other men, and that if they have erred the nature of their error ought to be ascertained in order that its repetition may be avoided. The former way is marvellously in favour just now with our Jingo papers, which are crying out hysterically for "reprisals," as one of them puts it, and especially for the suppression of any Indian newspaper which the Indian Government dislikes. The *Times*, for instance, thinks that the Government must stop "false and malicious misrepresentations of its motives and methods." False and malicious misrepresentations of motives and methods are the offences with which, in so many words, practically every Ministry constantly charges its opponents in this country. Every irritable Minister is sure that the Opposition and its press are "falsely misrepresenting" him, and doing it wilfully too. But in India the *Times* and those

who are no wiser propose that Government should be empowered to run away from whatever they choose to think a lie instead of facing it, and from what Lord George Hamilton said on Thursday there is some reason to fear that he has lost his head too. People who are able to keep their heads must be on the alert to prevent the Indian Government and the India Office from playing Russian or Turkish tricks with the freedom of the press in India under the delusion that they will make it any the easier to govern the country. With a free press—which, of course, does not mean a press exempt from the obligation to refrain, like individual citizens, from incitements to criminal offences—the Indian Government has some little light thrown on the sentiments of the peoples it governs, and may receive timely warnings of dangerous discontents. It must not be let blow out such rushlights of this kind as it has to light its way. It would be more to the purpose if a proper body were appointed to enquire into the circumstances preceding the Poona outrages. There is a strong presumption that a bad mistake was made, and unless the whole truth is brought out it will be felt that the same mistake may at any be committed again, perhaps with even more tragic results.—*Manchester Guardian*, July 3.

"THE PROPAGANDA OF TREASON."

It is full time, and a bit over, for the Indian Government to adopt stringent measures against native journals which systematically incite the population to rebellion. When we lately commented upon this vital matter we had before us only a few extracts from the disloyal prints, but to-day many additional samples of a still viler sort come to hand. Almost all taunt the inhabitants of the Western Presidency with lack of courage in not forcibly resisting the measures taken by Mr. Rand to stamp out the plague, and with hardly an exception lying representation is made that the soldiers employed in this work of humanity, at the peril of their own lives, are habitually guilty of the lowest blackguardism. In some instances, all disguise is thrown off, and the Government receives warning that the awful scenes of 1857 are likely to have early repetition. In one instance, it is even charged against Lord Elgin and his colleagues that they are taking revenge for the tortures inflicted by Tantia Topi on Europeans, an evident attempt to revive and accentuate those racial and religious animosities which culminated in the Mutiny. And so the propaganda of treason goes on day after day, week after week, without, apparently, any remedial steps being taken. We have not heard of a single prosecution from first to last: the result is, of course, that these vile defamers of British rule, believing themselves safe from punishment, go from bad to worse in their campaign of calumny. Nor does the seed of murderous treason always fall upon sterile soil; the late assassination of Lieutenant Ayerst, the simultaneous attempt to kill Mr. Rand, and the attack on a native detective, were unquestionably the first fruits of the intended harvest. But surely the Indian Penal Code must provide some means of dealing with incitements to rebellion and murder; there is not a civilised country in the world where Press licence would be permitted, for a single day, to proceed to such perilous lengths. Half-a-dozen successful prosecutions would probably suffice to stamp out an evil which, in its far-reaching consequences might be more terrible than the plague itself.—*Globe*, June 30.

WANT OF TACT AND DISCRETION.

There has been murder at Poona. The matter will naturally engage the attention of Parliament, and to-day an attempt will be made to beg the whole question of the remedy by suggesting the suppression of the liberties of the native Press. It would be a great mistake. If false reports are spread in the Press, the Government of India must find out how to spread true ones. It has ample means of every sort at its command, and it ought not to have to confess that it cannot meet the native scribes on their own ground. It will be much more to the point to enquire into the nature of the practices of which the people complain, and to ascertain if they cannot be modified in such a way as to remove the local prejudice against them. It is more than probable that the whole difficulty arises from a certain want of tact and discretion on the part of some persons in authority. The greased cartridge seemed too contemptible a grievance to require the display of those qualities—but we know what came of that.—*Daily News*, July 1.

THOSE WICKED RADICALS!

The latest news from India is like most of the evil tidings

that come at intervals from our remote Dependencies. It makes one wish most vehemently that the electorate had never at any time been prevailed on to instal a Radical Government at Westminster, for it proves anew that the Party of peace-at-any-price is the Party that does most to involve us in the trouble of war. There is no doubt that the existing disturbances in India—which enable us to realise the possibility of that second Mutiny on which our enemies are said to count—is due to the fact that for twelve years all sorts of discontented Babus have been allowed, by special permission of Lord Ripon, to scatter broadcast whatever venomous lies it occurred to them to utter. It has been all too clear for many a day that the granting of this license has had disastrous results. Their outward and visible sign has been murder, and we have learned since then, through the medium of copious quotations from the native Press, how it was that the crime came to be committed. We have rejoiced at Lord George Hamilton's assurance that Poona will be made to understand that Imperial Britain will not always be fettered by the errors of those who have served her from time to time according to the measure of their abilities.—*Morning Post*, July 3.

"A CATEGORICAL DENIAL."

We would draw attention to the character of the reply of the Bombay Government to the memorial of the Deccan Sabha complaining of the plague administration in Poona, and to the circumstances under which that reply was telegraphed. Lord Sandhurst's answer is chiefly a categorical denial; it was telegraphed in haste in reply to the Secretary of State's telegram. Upon what kind of enquiry is that answer based? We do not imagine that any reasonable man will, upon reflection, regard the bare denial of indignities as a sufficient answer to allegations signed by 2,000 persons, and corroborated in the startling letter which we have quoted at the head of this article. Nor can these two thousand persons, their statements and their feelings, be waived aside in the off-hand manner which a certain portion of the Press affect. Some of the signatories, at any rate, are representative men, some Government pensioners, some holding responsible positions. Moreover, those who have put their names to statements alleging specifically the pollution of their homes cannot in any case be lightly brushed aside. To these men that pollution is a grievous shame, even though they be not responsible, and, as reluctant witnesses to their own degradation, they claim with special force an attentive hearing. But above all stands out this admitted fact. Unless the letter from Mr. Rand is a forgery, women have been inspected for bubonic plague in the public streets of Poona by search parties containing men—and this, if nothing else, calls for vigorous enquiry at the hands of the Government. Do not let us be misunderstood. We are for stamping out rebellion promptly and sternly, though we are not for changing our general policy in a panic, and because of a special emergency. But we do not like haste or petulant anger directed not against special offenders, but against a whole people who have grievously suffered.—*Daily Chronicle*, July 7.

THE POONA BRAHMIN.

Poona, of course, has long been notorious as the hotbed of Southern India fanaticism; a town and district where the crafty, mutinous, semi-educated Brahmin walked at large, and freely propagated in newspaper and bazaar his faith in the liberation and regeneration of India on high-caste lines. . . . The Poona Brahmin sees the redcoats of the Poona garrison, and concentrates his fanatical intelligence on the simplest method for their extermination. Stagnation was his birthright, stagnation is his creed, and stagnation is the only coffin he requires. All that we have done for India is but oil on the flames of his revenge. And yet it is this man, whether as a Government official or a newspaper editor, who persuaded Lord Ripon and Lord Ripon's school of chicken-hearted philanthropists to give him an unbridled press, invite him to Government House and christen him a martyr. . . . The Brahmin fanatic is most powerful and hurtful in his press. There is no censorship in India. In fact, a censorship on Russian lines there never will be. But it is to-day very generally conceded that something must be done to teach the native editor the difference between press liberty and press licence; and the expurgation of the seditious and palpably lying articles against Queen, Government, and army is the one thing wanted. This form of censorship is indeed absolutely necessary, now and at once, if we wish to

save the contented and law-abiding portion of Hindus and Mussulmans from pitting themselves against our bayonets, at the instigation of the high-caste fanatic. Evidence goes to point that the Brahmin editor is responsible for the Poona outrages, and assassins by the pen may, in the long run, prove a deal more formidable to British rule in India than assassins by the sword.—*Daily Mail*, July 1.

"OUR LEAST REFLECTIVE JINGOES" AND THE GAG.

No sooner had the news been telegraphed from Poona than our least reflective Jingoes began to talk about a free press like mediæval cardinals and about education like Shakespeare's Jack Cade. The Indian press, they discovered on the spot, had too much freedom and too many natives of India were being educated. It is certain, or nearly certain, that the murders were due to ignorant and superstitious resentment of measures taken by British officials for the stamping out of the plague. Yet our wiseacres hold that superstition is best combated by suppressing the expression of free thought, and that you can eradicate ignorance most effectually by closing schools and colleges. One of Mr. Rudyard Kipling's stories describes the murder of an Englishman in India. He had petted the child of his Indian servant, and when the child died soon afterwards of fever the Indian attributed it to the Englishman's exercise of an evil eye, and so cut his throat quietly and secreted the body. The story leaves a striking impression of the gulf which mutual ignorance places between Europeans and natives of India and of the consequent dangers. Yet the moment they are reminded of those dangers these wild writers in England cry out that the gulf must be widened by every means in our power—native newspapers suppressed in order that the Indian Government may know less of what India is thinking, native colleges closed in order that young Indians may learn nothing of our ways and our literature. John Bright once said that the people of this country were a very good people, and that if it received wise advice democracy would be a success, but if it received bad advice then "God help it." It is receiving a marvellous amount of bad advice in detail, most of which may be summed up in the general counsel that it is to place material above moral interests, and to think more than it has done hitherto of being rich and strong, and less than it has done hitherto of suppressing slavery, of protecting peoples whose safety is guaranteed by British treaties, and of giving the people of India any good things of European civilisation that they care to receive. If those counsels were followed, no fleet could do much to delay our decadence.—*Manchester Guardian*, June 28.

SHALL THE PRESS BE GAGGED?

A good many Englishmen in India seem to be of opinion that the time has come for checking the licence of the vernacular Press by an act of the Legislature similar to that passed in Lord Lytton's time, and incontinently repealed by Lord Ripon. It may be necessary; but perhaps there is still time to attain the desired end by some less sensational device. The truth is that the internal peace of India is more effectively ensured by the individual experience and personal efforts of local officials than by the best-intentioned and most carefully-devised precautions invented at Simla or Calcutta for universal application. Some few years ago, in a famous and thickly-populated city in Upper India, the authorities had reason to anticipate a violent collision between Muhammadans and Hindus. Acting on his own responsibility, the English official in charge of the district sent formal letters to all the notabilities of the place requiring them, without exception, to appear and show cause why their dignities and privileges—seats at the Lieutenant-Governor's *durbars*, titles of honour, and so forth—should not be summarily cancelled. The hint was taken, and with one accord they used all their influence to prevent the threatened *smutts*. There was no riot at Delhi on that occasion. This precedent could scarcely be prescribed for imitation throughout India; but the moral, that an experienced district officer can sometimes find ways of his own for maintaining order, is well worth recording.—*Standard*, July 1.

PRESS CENSORSHIP "MADLY FOOLISH."

No doubt the Government of India must be allowed to deal in their own way with any sudden emergency, as with the ordinary requirements of the day. But interference with the liberty of the Press is a grave matter of public policy which cannot be settled without the decision of the Cabinet under their responsibility to the House of Commons. To anyone

acquainted with the history of India the suppression of native newspapers must seem sheer midsummer madness. Incitement to crime is punishable in India, as everywhere else, by the ordinary law. No quotation has been produced in this country from any Indian journal which could possibly be twisted into a suggestion that Mr. Ayerst or Mr. Rand, or anybody else, should be murdered. But, as "Loyal Indian" says, in his second and most excellent letter which we print to-day, "criticism of government action when rightly understood, is a help to good government." "If," adds our correspondent, in words which Lord George Hamilton would do well to learn by heart, "if I were plotting against the Government of India, the first thing I would hope for, wish for, ask for, would be the gagging of the vernacular press and of all newspapers conducted by my countrymen. The suppression of such papers would be like extinguishing of street lights to the burglar." It is not too much to say that if there had been a real vernacular press in India forty years ago there would have been no Indian Mutiny, because those whom it concerned would have been warned in time. The chupatties passed almost unnoticed. There were popular rumours and religious rites which meant nothing to a British officer, even if he saw or heard them. An article in a native newspaper can be read by everyone who does know Hindustani, and translated for everyone who does not. The only restrictions ever imposed upon the Indian Press were the work of the late Lord Lytton, whose example no one, except perhaps Lord George Hamilton, would desire to follow. Sir William Harcourt will be supported by the whole Liberal party in resisting any step so madly foolish as the establishment of a press censorship in India.—*Daily News*, July 3.

A PLEA FOR THE GAG.

Our complaint against the Government is that it is tempted to give too much deference to those who shout aloud for "Freedom of the Press" and "Home Rule for India." Lord George Hamilton's statement that the question will have to be considered if the vernacular Press of Poona be proved to have been directly implicated in the recent outrages is welcome, and it is all we can expect in the meantime. But unless something is done immediately to prune to the quick that pernicious plant of so-called freedom which was sown some twelve years ago in soil not suited for healthy growth, and hailed with so much rejoicing by the Radical Press in this country, we may have dire reason to regret at no distant date our lethargy and self-confident belief that we are never too late to mend anything.—*Morning Post*, July 2.

THE REAL DANGER—TORYISM RUN MAD.

The fuller details of the Indian disturbances and the evidences of continued unrest are disquieting enough, but it is questionable if in themselves they are one-half as disquieting as the persistent Tory refusal to consider and face their meaning and menace. Denials from the Governor of Bombay as to the truth of native grievances at Poona and explanations as to the trivial origin of the riots at Calcutta from the Viceroy of India are taken, in conjunction with the assertions of natives of the Mungerjee Bhownagree type, as disposing of the entire business. English or Anglo-Indian officialdom can do no wrong; and if the natives, out of sheer diabolical perversity, choose to construe its acts into grievances, they must take the consequences at the muzzles of the rifles of an armed police, backed by a reserve of soldiery in case of need. This is, in brief, the burden of columns of Tory comment upon the official versions of the unhappy condition of things in Bombay and Bengal; and any suggestion that further enquiry and discussion is necessary is dismissed as originating in the Radical tradition which believes evil of none but its own countrymen. At the bar of those who believe that at any given moment English rule everywhere is always as perfect as possible we stand condemned as "the trained apologists of disloyalty and sedition seeking to find some excuse for a crime." We say, that this mood on the part of the representatives of the Tory and official mind is vastly more disquieting than a murder here and a riot there, even though these are significant of a widespread spirit of revolt; for it is in every respect typical of the mood which has lost thrones and ruined empires since thrones and empires began to be.—*Bradford Observer*, July 7.

THE BLACK MAN.

The black man is the black man after all. You can train a

tiger to perform tricks, you can even make a pet of him; but he is a tiger all the same, and one day you will know it. Let those who write and speak in London against the English in India remember that their words are telegraphed out to the worst press in the world almost as soon as they are uttered. We look to Lord George Hamilton for much more determined action than he has taken at present, and we are amazed that Lord Elgin should remain at Simla when his duty obviously calls him to Calcutta.—*Daily Mail*, July 5.

WANTED: JUDICIAL ENQUIRY.

It looks as if events were conspiring to attract the attention of the public at home, though it be only for a moment, to the condition of India. A cynic might perhaps draw an unpleasant conclusion if he compared the excitement provoked here by the recent assassinations at Poona with the rather general indifference to the deeper problems suggested by the famine and the plague. But the Poona affair, deplorable as it is, will not have occurred in vain if it sets our optimists thinking about the great, and, we fear, growing, gulf between Indian and Anglo-Indian. The majority of our Jingo writers are no doubt prepared to assume off-hand that the murders of Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand are directly due to inflammatory writing in the vernacular press. They probably forget, by the way, what a colossal object-lesson in bad citizenship is offered by their own angry diatribes at such a crisis as this. What most people would like to see in this matter is full and impartial enquiry—by which we mean, of course, judicial enquiry. At present there is a direct conflict of testimony on the all-important question of the behaviour of the European troops employed in the plague operations at Poona. We must, of course, accept Lord Sandhurst's denial of the charges contained in the joint memorial forwarded on May 10th to the Bombay Government by 2,000 Hindus and Muhammadans of Poona, so far as these denials represent personal knowledge. But the greater part of the document read by Lord G. Hamilton in the House of Commons was mere generality. It will perhaps be difficult to get aggrieved persons to come forward and give evidence under present circumstances. But that fact, if fact it be, does not get rid of the Government's duty. On the contrary, it makes it all the more necessary that the enquiry which ought to have followed close upon the heels of the allegations, should now be conducted with the most scrupulous care and impartiality.—*Progressive Review* (August).

FIRMNESS AND FORBEARANCE.

In the second extract which we publish from Lord Roberts's book is a significant commentary on the license accorded to the native Press, and the influence which this license has upon the minds of all classes of the community. The native Press, as he says, is not an indigenous growth, but an exotic. It is a draught of the strong new wine of the West poured into the old bottles of the East. No doubt it has its uses, if only as a safety-valve. Grievances find a vent which otherwise might assume a more dangerous form if kept in a state of suppression. Equally true, however, it is that the native Press grossly abuses its privileges. The most utterly unfounded charges are made against officials honestly doing their duty, with no other object than that of bringing British rule into contempt and dislike, or of pandering to the secret societies with which parts of India are honeycombed. We are no advocates of muzzling the Press, but it is obviously the duty of the Government in India, as in England or Ireland, to proceed rigorously against publications which deliberately incite to sedition, outrage and assassination. That was Cromwell's advice: "Do not withhold rights because they are abused; punish those who abuse them." Firmness and forbearance judiciously blended may be trusted to quell these disturbances in India, which, after all, are only comparatively small additions to the great burden of Empire.—*Daily Telegraph*, July 5.

"SOME SORT OF PALLIATION."

The Poona affair certainly looks very unpleasant, and there is bad news, too, now from Chitpur. We have, we need hardly say, no sort of sympathy with the unscrupulous agitators who have stirred up the ill-feeling, but is it quite certain that we have done all we could to prevent giving them a handle? Have we sufficiently consulted the very keen religious scruples of the population? All honour to the British troops who have voluntarily undertaken work which must have been as dangerous as it was certainly disagreeable. But we doubt if it is wise to use Tommy Atkins for work of this kind. If our

information is correct, in other parts of India it is native troops which have carried out the sanitary precautions necessary to fight the plague. At Poona this was not done—it may be because it could not be. But if the facts are as we have stated them, this should both reassure us about India as a whole, and at the same time furnish some sort of palliation for those at Poona who were misled into outrage—though not for those who misled them, since they certainly know enough of the facts to know that the British authorities were only acting in the interests of the people.—*Westminster Gazette*, July 1.

"PERILOUS SELF-SUFFICIENCY."

Sir M. M. Bhownaggee, rather amusingly eager to show that he means to render a *quid pro quo* for his unearned decoration, tells us in the *Morning Leader* without much circumlocution that the Indian National Congress, and the British Committee of the Congress, are at the bottom of the whole trouble. The casual observer might well think that the Congress is to Sir M. M. Bhownaggee what King Charles's head was to Mr. Dick. It is that and something more. Sir M. M. Bhownaggee, politically speaking, lives and thrives upon the Congress—that is upon his opposition to it. But a man in his position with regard to the India Office must not expect sensible people to accept his account of the Congress. They are much more likely to accept the account, both of it and of the vernacular press, which is given by Sir Richard Garth—a Tory, a Privy Councillor, a Q.C., and a former Chief Justice of Bengal. Sir Richard Garth finds the Congress a loyal and patriotic body, specially valuable to Government as a source of information. He finds the vernacular press, not seditious, but full of useful and moderate criticism which is dangerous only to those who contumaciously ignore it. Men like Sir M. M. Bhownaggee, while the authorities in India are so often groping in the dark, would extinguish such rushlights as are afforded by the Congress and the press, and remove the influence of education in dispelling superstition and ignorance. Such a policy is merely idiotic and suicidal. The outrages at Poona seem to us to illustrate nothing more remarkably than this—a wilful refusal on the part of our countrymen in India to pay heed to complaints, to appreciate warnings, and to take advice. What is the meaning of this temper? It has, at any rate, all the appearance of a fatuous and perilous self-sufficiency.—*The Star*, July 5.

SELF-COMPLACENCY AND CONTEMPT.

Self-complacency and enormous contempt for the natives mar a good deal of our administrative work in India. The health of the Indian army is a standing proof of the carelessness and inefficiency of many of our officers. The disturbance, at Chitpur, and the still more dangerous sedition at Poona, must have been due to some serious blundering. Of course, the official telegrams read by Lord George Hamilton simply states that the official conduct of affairs was faultless. We are accustomed to official perfection. The Royal Irish Constabulary were never admitted to have made a mistake. But Lord George Hamilton really seems to overdo it altogether. A memorial signed by over 2,000 leading citizens of Poona, and confirmed from numberless other sources, cannot be altogether wrong. We should have been much more inclined to believe that Lord Sandhurst's administrators in Poona had been practically blameless if he had not rebutted in detail every single charge made against them. Red tape is becoming far too plentiful; nothing is more fatal to good government. As for the Tory journals which advocate the suppression of the Indian Press, one cannot help regarding their attitude with a good deal of contempt. The suppression of the freedom of the Press has been compared to cutting out a rattle-snake's rattle. The danger-signal disappears, but the danger remains. The freedom of the Press is indeed one of the greatest securities of Indian administration. It publishes all grievances imaginary or real, and enables our administrators to judge popular feeling and to humour popular foibles in a way which would otherwise be impossible. Of course incitement to outrage, whether in the Press or anywhere else, is a crime in every country and must be punished. But you have no right or reason to prohibit the ventilation of grievances even if 75 per cent. of them are wholly imaginary. We advise our readers to look at Lord George Hamilton's reply to Sir William Wedderburn, and to ask themselves the question:—"Is self-complacency a criterion of good government?"—*Leeds Mercury*, July 6.

"SOWING THE WIND."

Unquestionably, a very dangerous spirit of insubordination is growing up in India and spreading through the land. How is it proposed to be dealt with? In the usual British fashion, of course—by Coercion. India is to be treated as Ireland would be treated, indeed as Ireland has been treated, under similar circumstances. Lord George Hamilton has retracted the half promise which he gave to Sir William Harcourt, that no repression of the native Press will be attempted without the express sanction of the House of Commons. The *Times*, of course, approves, in its customary truculent style, of the abandonment of this pledge. The House of Commons, it argues, has no privilege to interpose between the high mightiness of Anglo-Indian officialdom and its victims. The policy of suppressing the native press, as might be expected, finds a strenuous advocacy in the *Times*. How entirely unjustifiable from the impartial standpoint is the contemplated policy of the Government may be judged from their refusal to submit it to the House of Commons, where they command so enormous a majority. It can be easily imagined what will be the inflammatory effect in India of measures too violent and indefensible even for a Tory House of Commons. If the British Government will persist in this fashion in sowing the wind in India the harvest of the whirlwind cannot be long delayed.—*Freeman's Journal*, July 6.

The complaints of the people of Poona about the manner in which the search for plague patients was carried out are evidently not entirely without foundation. Sir Lepel Griffin, one of the last men to show any sympathy with agitators, condemns the employment of British soldiers for this purpose as certain to give offence. It is all very well to say that decency was observed. Decency is purely a matter of custom, and what would be strictly decent according to European notions might seem grossly indecent to Orientals. Instead of treating such complaints as seditious, the authorities, if they were wise, would meet them with the most careful and patient attention.—*Professor E. S. Beesly in the Positivist Review*.

A mistake may have been made in employing British soldiers instead of natives in enforcing laws which are distasteful to the prejudices and customs of the native population; but it is probable that the Indian Government will have to decide, and that right soon, whether or not it is worth while risking a rebellion in order to save the lives of people who would much rather die than be kept alive by European methods of sanitation. If the natives have made up their minds, as they appear to have done, that life is not worth living if sanitary inspectors are to be free to poke their noses into their domestic arrangements, we had much better let them die and be done with it. There is a zeal for sanitation which leads men to sanction a kind of persecution that is every whit as indefensible as the Inquisition.—*Review of Reviews* (July).

It is necessary to check the absurd tendency of successive Indian Secretaries to regard the friends of India who are connected with the Indian Congress as enemies, who tell untruths, and who must be put down. Lord George Hamilton likes to gibe at these representatives, who are often better informed than he is. By raising a general debate, the Liberal leader will cover with hisegis this relatively small body of members, and, for the time being, act on the same line of policy—that of frank and patriotic criticism.—*West rn Mercury*, July 9.

The so-called Indian Congress is another source of trouble. In regard to this, again, a parallel is to be found in organisations in this country, for it is the professional politician who works the oracle in many of our political movements, just as it is by the same class of persons that the same thing is done in India. But there is obviously a greater danger when a war of caste is set on foot, and subject races are incited to rebel, than when it is simply one social class or one political party that rails against another. The Indian Congress does not truly represent any Indian interests—it is an organisation of mere agitators, who thrive on the profits of their agitation.—*Yorkshire Herald*, July 9.

The fact is, we have a weak and incompetent Secretary for India, and that fact is recognised both in India and at home. The Legislative Council in India has given Lord George Hamilton an unprecedented slap in the face in connexion with the Contagious Diseases Acts. The home Government have sent out certain suggestions. The Indian Government has

decided to ignore these suggestions, and not only so, but to act in an absolutely opposite direction. It is absurd to suppose that all these troubles in India and the fact that Lord George Hamilton is at the India Office are to be regarded as a mere accidental coincidence. Directly the Anglo-Indian out there recognised the fact that at this end there was a Secretary who could be played with, they naturally began to do as they liked.—*Morning Leader*, July 10.

It would be unpardonably silly if the Government were to import some of those Continental methods of Press censorship which we are never tired of decrying from a distance, when we have no personal experience of the inconvenience and danger resulting from too great liberty of the Press in an ignorant and inflammable community. At the risk of appearing inconsistent, though, we trust that the utmost tolerance will be shown towards the native newspapers, even when they may appear to overstep the bounds of freedom and reason. Many years ago Lord Salisbury remarked with truth that the natives of India were politically dumb, and an unceasing effort ought to be made to teach them how to give coherent utterance to their wants and feelings.—*Observer*, July 4.

That the people of India are in a very irritable and disheartened mood, and disposed to believe that heaven is angry with their rulers is unhappily too true, but some allowance ought to be made for their ill-temper. They have been very much harassed. The worst effects of the great famine, which is not yet over, have fallen upon the people of the North-West, who are everywhere in all the cities the roughest class, and upon those of the Central Provinces, who are allied in every way by blood and language and creed with the Mahrattas. The plague, which has been a terrible visitation, has fallen upon the latter first of all, and upon the people of Bombay, and it is they who have to bear the loss of property, the cruel panic, and the flight which is its consequence, and the harassing sanitary regulations which are to the majority unintelligible, and because they compel violations of privacy and of what natives consider decency are almost intolerably offensive. It is right as well as expedient to make allowance for such feelings, and, as far as possible, to avoid violence leading to sanguinary scenes.—*Economist*, July 10.

With regard to the dissatisfaction we are strongly under the impression that we have given sufficient cause for it, and should be thankful that the uproar is not more serious and widespread. The situation is simple enough. Our London contemporaries, clever and influential as they are, should endeavour to understand it, and repress the facile tendency of sneering at the Brahmin. The Brahmin is—poor soul—painted a great deal blacker than he is.—*Manchester Evening Chronicle*, July 3.

Mr. Samuel Smith has given notice that he will, at an early date, call the attention of the House of Commons to the great loss and suffering caused to India by plague, famine, and earthquake, and to the desirability of the Home Government endeavouring to mitigate that distress by making a grant to the Indian Government for additional relief to the sufferers; and also to the need of more effective representation of Indian opinion in the Government of the Country, so that greater economy may be practised in Military Expenditure, and more attention paid to internal reforms, especially in the direction of larger irrigation works and more extended elementary education.

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of Magdalen College, and Secretary of the Appointments Committee in the University of Oxford, acts as Guardian to persons coming to England for Education, and gives information as to the methods available of Education, General and Professional. Address Secretary, INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools), 44, High Street, Oxford, England.—(Advt.)

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTRUSTED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

[OFFICES: 64 AND 66, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, E.C.W.]

VOL. VIII., No. 9.
(NEW SERIES.)

SEPTEMBER, 1897.

[Subscription, Post Free,
SIX SHILLINGS PER ANNO.
IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	267	The Case for Enquiry at Poona: Sir W. Wedderburn and his Constituents	276
The "Forward" Policy in Practice:		"The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast"	278
I.—By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D. ..	264	The "Forward" Policy and its Fruits:	
II.—By J. Dacosta	266	The So-called "Frontier Risings"	280
The Debate on the Indian Budget:		Sir John Adye's View	282
I.—Lord George Hamilton's Statement, by H. Morgan-Browne	267	Colonel Hanna's View	282
II.—By W. M. J. Williams	269	Mr. Ramesh Chunder Dutt's Suggestion	284
Agricultural Banks in Mysore	271	"We Told you So"	284
The Fruits of the "Forward" Policy	273	Some Opinions of the Press	286
The Functions of the Congress	275	Indians and the "Diamond Jubilee"	287
		Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects ..	289

Indiana.

The Budget Debate. The debate in the House of Commons on the Indian Secretary's annual statement cannot be regarded as fruitful.

Unsatisfactory in itself, the statement called forth little criticism of a nature likely to be allowed a hopeful future, except indeed such antiquated incrustations of prejudice and ignorance as are already well baked and likely to be baked still harder. The deluded optimism of the present and the past Secretaries with all its high-falutin' rhetoric was discounted, though of course it will do its mischievous work in India and at home. The well-intentioned remarks of several independent members were perhaps less helpful than they would have been if they had been based on fuller knowledge and expressed with greater caution. As it was they seemed to furnish unhappy opportunities for official optimism to ride off on irrelevancies and to create a false demonstration in its own favour. The whole performance was unreal, and suggests not a little cause for uneasiness in the minds of those who bethink themselves of the responsibilities of English statesmanship. The situation revealed by the figures of the Budget is simply deplorable. In two years, with a perilously weak treasury, the loss caused by the famine and the plague is set down at some Rs. 12,000,000 apart from some Rs. 2,000,000 of advances, supposed to be recoverable. Lord George

Hamilton, indeed, boasts that "the whole of this loss has been met out of the Indian treasuries within the space of two years, and without the imposition of any additional taxation." Reviewing the accounts for 1895-96, he claims that the facts recited by him

"show that there is in our Indian system of finance considerable elasticity, more than sufficient to meet the growth of ordinary wants";

and, on an examination of the figures for 1896-97, he finds that they

"again exhibit the same phenomena as the preceding year—a large surplus over ordinary expenditure, endorsing the results of the preceding year, and showing there is a large margin of income over ordinary expenditure to meet the special charges to which a country like India is ever subject."

It would be an interesting experience to watch Sir James Westland's face when he reads the Secretary for India's optimistic exposition of the finances of the country, and to hear his private running commentary.

THE discovery of "considerable elasticity" in the system of finance should be particularly delightful to the Finance Minister at Calcutta. Later in the debate Sir Henry Fowler cited the Mahārājā of Darbhanga, to whose authority he paid a just tribute, as making a statement on the express assumption that the imposition of further taxes is impossible. The authority of the Mahārājā will not be strained by the assumption. It is a commonplace of financial knowledge. The misfortune is that it does not

square very comfortably with the gay assertion of "considerable elasticity." For the current year, however, Lord George Hamilton cheers the House with the announcement that "the revenue, taking the land tax, the salt tax, and various other things, is better by Rs. 2,485,300." This is an estimate in forecast. It may come right, or it may be reduced by inevitable remissions or by impossibilities of collection. In any case, if one assumes that all is recovered in due time, what does it mean? We have already set forth its full significance in these columns. It means that the authorities in their dire distress are desperately attempting to do the very thing that the Maharájá—and everybody else—declares to be impossible. If they are not putting on taxes of a fresh description, they are squeezing to the bone the taxes already in existence, which is a branch of the impossible thing. The land tax is the staple revenue of the Government. We have already pointed out that it has long reached its rational limits, and has passed to a point of oppressive, if not intolerable, strain, and that not merely as to amount but especially as to the method of collection. We again invite the Government to give their serious attention to the significance of the grievous list of ejectments and distraints for non-payment of land tax, and particularly to the delayed answer to the allegations of Mr. Rogers in respect of the rayats of Madras. As for the salt tax, if a blush could be imagined on an official cheek, that blush might have been expected to be distinctly visible to the naked eye when Lord George Hamilton announced the expected increase from this miserable source of revenue. The "elasticity" of the salt tax is about the last thing that any statesman could mention without a feeling of intolerable shame. Besides all this, the provincial Governors have something to say in the matter. The Secretary of State expressly acknowledged in his statement that Bengal, Madras, and Bombay "complain bitterly of the check to progress" consequent upon the depletion of the local balances, and that,

"Sir Alexander Mackenzie in the Viceroy's Council last year, and Sir Arthur Havelock in his own Council this year, have vigorously protested against the proportions of the revenues assigned."

It is a very simple exercise for Lord George Hamilton to hold the scales with a semblance of impartiality between the Local and the Central Government, in the House of Commons. As a matter of course, he takes care not to touch the root of the question, but plays to the gallery with a fantastic manipulation of the fringes. That class of prestidigitation is good enough for the faithful Commons, and for the illusion of an ignorant or careless electorate. There are some of us, however, who look for serious treatment of serious problems

at the hands of professed statesmen, and resent such trifling with the nation's trust in a question fraught with vital issues. The fundamental difficulty arises from the extraordinary expenditure. We make every allowance for famine, plague, exchange, external defence, and even earthquakes. But it is now patent to everybody—not official—that the essence of the mischief lies in the policy of external defence, which has been pursued so detrimentally to India during the past twenty years. With this matter we deal elsewhere in the current issue, and need only signalise the fact here. So long as the Government persists on the present "forward" lines, it is a moral certainty that there can be no internal progress, no balancing of the accounts (except by the vicious system of loans), and no contentment within the precious frontier where the taxation squeezed from the people is poured out like water on the barren rocks and sands.

As regards internal development, Mr. Samuel Smith, whose benevolent interest in India is recognised on both

sides of the House, had pressed upon Lord George Hamilton the need of irrigation works. Lord George replied that the area within which great irrigation works could be undertaken was becoming exhausted. But that, of course, was no answer to Mr. Smith's point that "irrigation by wells and tanks was possible over nearly all India," and that "our policy should be to encourage the peasantry by every means to do their own irrigation." The truth is, we fear, as Mr. Smith said, that powerful British interests are constantly pressing the India Office to extend railways, for which most of the material is bought in this country, but there is no pressure to extend irrigation works, for which the outlay is all in India. The pushing forward of railway building looks like energetic progress, and lends itself to political advertisement. But it is probably the case that not a single life need now be lost in time of famine for want of railway service. Railways, we have always admitted, are in the highest degree important for internal development morally and materially, and, therefore, there need to be strong reasons before one can venture to discourage further constructions. If, however, it be acknowledged, as we believe it is acknowledged by famine experts, that no more railways are needed for the sole purpose of famine, then the only other ground remaining is the strategic necessity of what is called, but wrongly called, the frontier. It may be doubted whether even that necessity is not also amply satisfied. The building of fresh railways for other internal purposes ought clearly to wait upon the rise of prosperity in the treasury, or rather in the country. It is absurd to add gratuitous harassments in a time of financial

depression. To us who have insisted through good and through evil report on the more careful development of the industries of the country, there is much satisfaction in Lord George Hamilton's avowal that "a cardinal feature in our policy should be to multiply and vary industrial occupations, and render the ever-increasing population less dependent upon the vagaries of the rainfall of one year."

Our satisfaction will be very materially increased when we find this pious aspiration reduced to fruitful practice. To his remarks on education we must demur at several points. The Universities, he says, lead only to the Bar or to the Press. One must really have some regard for the influence of education, apart from professional outlets. The Bar and the Press, however, are not the only destinies. But, taking Lord George's own assumption, we must ask, Why is this so? Are we not stultifying ourselves by opening up educational avenues that lead nowhere, except into mischief—excessive litigation and pernicious journalism? (Though, by the way, it is not, even in the opinion of the most stupid critics, the educated journals that are pernicious.) Why not utilise all this educated ability for the purposes of the country? The public service must inevitably be opened up to the youth of the land. If not—well, then, *corruptio optimi pessima*, and we have no right to complain, except against our own short-sighted administration.

"Is it impossible," asks Lord George, "to so alter the current and tendency of the education we give as to associate it with objects of practical and technical character, by which India's latent resources might be developed, her industries multiplied, and her productive power extended?"

It is quite possible. The current indeed is already setting in that direction, and may easily be fostered. But the men must have *la carrière ouverte aux talents*. And some Native States we wot of could give Lord George some useful hints from their own more enterprising experience.

In view of the debate on the Indian Budget notice had been given of no fewer than seven motions. As the official motion submitted to the House with reference to the Accounts themselves is a mere statement of the total revenue and expenditure for a particular year, it is said that no amendment (unless it be to take exception to the actual figures) may be moved. Non-official critics, therefore, can bring pressure to bear only upon the motion to go into Committee. Upon this motion almost any conceivable subject may be discussed, but a division may be taken upon only one amendment. Even this amendment has hardly the remotest chance of success, for to negative a motion to go into Committee is to defeat the Government which is responsible for the transaction

of business. The ballot, on this occasion, gave first place to Mr. Swift MacNeill, and the division upon his amendment (against which the "tallars" were, of course, the Government Whigs), prevented any further division. The text of the seven motions which stood upon the paper was as follows:—

Mr. MACNEILL.—To move, That this House views with grave disapproval the fact that famine, plague, and pestilence in India have been seized by the Indian Government for an attack on the freedom of the press in India, and for the revival of the system of arrest of British subjects in India under the law of *lettre de cachet*, and the indefinite imprisonment without trial of persons thus arrested; and desires to place on record its conviction that the only safe foundation for government in India is to be sought in the extension to British subjects in India of the full privileges of the British Constitution.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN.—To move, That, looking to the condition of the masses of the Indian people and their grievous sufferings during the present year, this House desires to express its deep sympathy in their distress, and trusts that Her Majesty's Government will institute a detailed and searching Village Enquiry into the causes which blight the industry of the cultivators and render them helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine and pestilence.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH.—To call attention to the great loss and suffering caused to India by plague, famine, and earthquake, and to the desirability of the Home Government endeavouring to mitigate that distress by making a grant to the Indian Government for additional relief to the sufferers; and also to the need of more effective representation of Indian opinion in the government of the country, so that greater economy may be practised in military expenditure, and more attention paid to internal reforms, especially in the direction of larger irrigation works and more extended elementary education.

Sir MANCHERJE BHOWNAGORE.—To move, That this House views with concern the fact that the old industries of India are fast disappearing without being replaced by new ones to any appreciable extent, with the result that its vast population has to largely depend on the imports of foreign manufactures for even the most ordinary articles of every-day use, a circumstance to which is mainly due the condition of poverty under which large sections of the people of India still labour; and that, inasmuch as the present system of education, among other causes, has had a tendency to divert the energies of the people from the preservation and development of industrial pursuits, this House is of opinion that an enquiry should be held, by such means as the Government of India consider advisable, with a view to ascertaining and suggesting measures for remedying the evils indicated.

Mr. JAMES STUART.—To call attention to the reply of the Government of India to the Despatch of the Secretary of State of the 26th day of March last, relating to the health of the Indian Army; and to move, That this House disapproves of the repeal of the Cantonment Act Amendment Act of 1895.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS.—To move, That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in future no Indian Prince or Chief shall be deposed on the ground of maladministration or misconduct until the fact of such maladministration or misconduct shall have been established to the satisfaction of a public tribunal which shall command the confidence alike of the Government and of the Princes and Chiefs of India.

Mr. PARON.—To move, That in the opinion of this House, the present famine has shown that there is a necessity for further means of transport in India, and that special attention should be given to the subject of irrigation and to the construction of waterways in suitable districts.

Lord George Hamilton graciously and vaguely remarked that *some* of these motions were important. But he did his best to hamper discussion upon them. Not content with relegating the Budget debate to a single day, and that the day before the prorogation of Parliament, he insisted upon making his financial statement, not in Committee, but upon the motion to go into Committee. This proceeding had two results. It telescoped up the speeches of his critics into the evening, with the result that many speeches which were meant to be delivered were not delivered. And it prevented his critics from being adequately reported in the daily newspapers. If anything were needed to complete the farce of the Budget debate in Parliament, it would be found in this shabby manoeuvre.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL'S amendment Mr. MacNeill's was defeated by eighty votes. But it was supported in the lobby by seventeen members—Messrs. Atherley Jones, Austin, Colville, T. B. Curran, T. Curran, John Dillon, Doogan, MacAleese, M'Cartan, J. F. X. O'Brien, J. O'Connor, Shee, D. Sullivan, Tanner, Weir, Whittaker, and Sir W. Wedderburn, in addition to the tellers, Mr. MacNeill and Mr. Michael Davitt. It is hardly necessary to say that the majority against the amendment included Sir Henry Fowler, who once more indulged in the manifestly congenial game of capping optimism with a Tory Secretary of State. For our part, while we cordially recognise the humane and sympathetic spirit which animated the speeches of Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Michael Davitt, and Mr. John Dillon, we can hardly regard the actual terms of the amendment as well chosen. To protest against attacks upon the freedom of the press, and the deportation of British subjects without trial, is one thing. To propose, in so many words, "the extension to British subjects in India of the full privileges of the British Constitution" is another thing. Mr. MacNeill's meaning might, one would think, have been at once more precisely and more happily expressed. Indeed, it is only fair to say that Mr. MacNeill, in his admirable speech, was careful to meet some of the criticisms which, as he plainly foresaw, the words of his amendment might provoke.

"He wished hon. members (he said) to have no misconception of his meaning. He wished those privileges to be gradually extended, and first, that personal liberty should be secured. He wished, in the words of Edmund Burke, that freedom should be as much the privilege of the poorest British subject in India as of the British subject in London. That personal freedom the natives of India had not. If we would govern India, not for the good of England, but for the good of India, and that would redound to the good of England, our first duty should be to extend to India justice and mercy. . . . Having this great nation with its civilisation and religious

feeling under our charge, we should do our best to show them forbearance, kindness, and consideration, giving them a reasonable, rightful measure of management of their own affairs."

Sir Charles Dilke and Lord George Hamilton had something to say by way of discounting the speeches of Mr. MacNeill and his friends. But if the grievances of India can be remedied, what matter can it possibly be whether the remedy be "general" or particular? If a general remedy is applicable, let it be applied. If a particular remedy is applicable, let it be applied. To apply the British constitution *en bloc* to a vastly dissimilar state of things would be sufficiently preposterous. The suggestion, if it were made, would need no discussion. But the position in India does demand that statesmen should make up their minds whether the British power in India is to be but another in the long line of tyrannies, or whether it is to attempt to lead the peoples to some idea and practice of self-government. Except in times of panic, we are all for the progressive idea, though recent occurrences have shown how readily we revert to the primitive type. But, assuming the normal state of expectation that the Indians will develop some governmental ideas not of the old tyrannical cast, does not one perceive that they must be led on gradually, and that the process is a long and delicate one, calling for much consideration and accommodation? Even the official reports acknowledge that the limited representative system works well, with exceptions that are surprising only in the fewness of their numbers. If the conditions are diverse—and they are—why not accommodate the practical administration to the varieties of diversity? We stand as firm as Lord George Hamilton or Sir Henry Fowler against any step that can reasonably be considered rash. What we deplore is that really good intentions should be so often marred by an official timidity which is so much the outcome of imperfect knowledge, imperfect judgment, or imperfect sympathies. The question of Indian government is steadily increasing its pressure, and it is about time that statesmanship knew its own mind.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN took the opportunity of pressing again for the detailed enquiry in a few typical villages which he proposed in the debate on the Address at the beginning of the Session. Lord George Hamilton would, one imagines, have had considerable difficulty in resisting this suggestion a second time, if it had been in the form of an amendment upon which a division could be taken. But Mr. MacNeill's amendment blocked the way, and no attempt was made to reply to Sir W. Wedderburn's contentions. Lord George Hamilton, it is true, said in the course of his Budget statement that some

valuable reports would be published giving details of the administration and distribution of the famine relief fund.

"These reports (he added), and those emanating from the officials in charge of relief, will, no doubt, offer many excellent suggestions, and I have little doubt that out of the experience of the present year such an improvement will be made in the already effective famine code as will make its administration in any future famine as great an improvement upon the work of this year as this year's work was upon the administration of twenty years back."

But that, of course, is not the point. Revision of the famine code in the light of new experience is, no doubt, important enough in its way. But what is wanted above all else is rather prevention than cure. Sir W. Wedderburn asked for a village enquiry to discover the microbes which blight the prosperity of the rayat, and so to afford information which might lead to the prevention of famine. Lord George Hamilton offers precisely what Sir W. Wedderburn deprecated as inadequate by themselves, namely, "purely official enquiries in the ordinary departmental routine." The necessary reforms can hardly be expected from investigations of this kind if, as Sir William contends, "the existing official system is chiefly to blame for the rayat's difficulties." Lord George Hamilton is simply burying his head in the sand. Nor does he make matters better by labelling as "excellent" official suggestions which he has not yet seen.

IN this connexion we may refer to the remarkable and admirable article contributed by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt to the August number of the *Fortnightly Review* under the title "Famines in India and their Remedy." In this article, which had the incidental advantage of answering in advance a large part of Lord George Hamilton's Budget speech of August 5, the able Commissioner of the Orissa Division offered three suggestions for the improvement of the condition of the Indian peasantry:—

(i) a contribution from the British Exchequer towards the military expenses of England's Asiatic Empire (misnamed India), and a reduction of the "Home Charges";

(ii) a reform in the administration and the removal of certain causes which are palpably leading to the impoverishment of the cultivators;

(iii) a settlement in perpetuity of the revenues derived from the soil.

It is, Mr. Dutt thinks, premature to hold out the hope that any remedies can wholly prevent famines if the periodical rains fail in India. But it is possible to provide remedies which will lessen the force of famines when they come, and these are to be found in improvement of the material condition of the people. As to (i), the first suggestion, Mr. Dutt points out that India now pays not only for her internal administration, not only for the army and

the defensive works within her own limits, but also for the maintenance of England's Empire in Asia outside the limits of India—in Burma, for example, in Beluchistan, in Afghanistan, and in China. This is not as it should be. England should pay a fixed proportion of the total military expenditure which is now incurred in India and which is driving India back in despair to "taxes which every civilized country has discarded." An equitable contribution of this kind would, in Mr. Dutt's opinion, be more acceptable to India than any special grant (though, we may add, that is no reason why the special grant which has lately been talked of should not be forthcoming as well). Under suggestion (ii), Mr. Dutt remarks that hard and fast rules and regulations, framed no doubt with the most benevolent intentions, often bear hardly on the agricultural classes. Here one is reminded of two of the "microbes" to which Sir W. Wedderburn has called attention:—

(a) The harsh and rigid mode of revenue collection, which drives the rayat to the money-lender; and

(b) The establishment of debt courts on the European model, which arm the money-lender with all the power of the empire. But Mr. Dutt gives most of his space to suggestion (iii) which turns out to be the removal of Sir W. Wedderburn's first "microbe"—the excessive revenue demand.

"No single act of the British Government that can be named has," Mr. Dutt says, "done so much for the prosperity and well-being of the people as the permanent settlement of the land revenue of Bengal effected by Lord Cornwallis in 1793."

And Mr. Dutt proves, from personal knowledge, and by most interesting instances, the self-reliance of the Bengal cultivators. Why not, therefore, extend the permanent settlement—as Canning would done if death had not prevented him?

"There is no other question which so directly and vitally affects the condition of the mass of the people as this. Land is the source of living of four-fifths of the population: leave them a good margin of profits from land and they are prosperous; sweep away all increase in the profits from land into the Imperial treasury at every settlement, and they are impoverished and helpless."

It is earnestly to be hoped that Mr. Dutt's practical suggestions, coming as they do from the ripe experience of one of the most brilliant members of the Indian Civil Service, will command the attention which they deserve at the hands of responsible authorities here and in India.

The Indian Army.

WITH Lord George Hamilton's commendation of the Indian Army nobody will be inclined to quarrel. But his comparison of the proportion of military to civil population in India with the corresponding proportion in France, Germany or even England is beside the mark. France and Germany are known to be

well-nigh exhausted by the weight of their military burdens in spite of their great wealth. England, released from similar obligations by her geographical position, is still compelled, or thought to be compelled, to maintain a large force to supply the needs of her wide empire. But in India, with her native police drilled and equipped in military fashion, the number of troops required for garrison purposes in the interior is very small, and practically the sole function of the Indian army is the so-called "defence" (which is Anglo-Indian for "extension") of the frontiers. A glance at a "large map" will show that the only frontier which need be considered is the North-West. So that the question resolves itself into one of policy merely—by which we mean Imperial policy. In a debt-burdened, impoverished country like India the standard of armaments should obviously be the minimum consistent with her needs—not any proportion existing in a wealthy country armed to the teeth either for conquest or through fear of wealthy and powerful enemies. The "forward" policy in India is not only not worth its cost in money and men, but, if it were, it ought to be a charge upon the Imperial Treasury. The advocates of the policy are well aware of this fact. But they are also aware that the moment when the cost of the forward policy comes before the House of Commons for sanction and payment by British taxpayers, the little hour of that policy will have ended. Lord George Hamilton thinks that the army in India is extremely small, and is not an element of aggression but the guardian of industry. That is not the view of the military member of the Viceroy's Council. Sir Henry Brackenbury, in his recent evidence before Lord Welby's Commission, cited by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt in his article in the August number of the *Fortnightly Review*, said:

"In the first place, I would say that the army in India is largely in excess of the requirements for the preservation of internal order in India. The strength of the army in India is calculated to allow of a powerful field army being placed on or beyond the Indian frontier, in addition to the obligatory garrisons required for keeping order in India. The necessity for maintaining in India the powerful field army in addition to the obligatory garrisons is caused by the approach of a great military power into a position which enables her directly to threaten Afghanistan, to which we are under treaty obligations, and indirectly to threaten the security of India itself. The foreign policy of India is directed entirely from England by Her Majesty's Government, and it is part of British foreign policy generally—indeed, the object of British foreign policy as I believe it to be—to secure Great Britain's rule over her Empire. If we desired to maintain British rule in India only for India's sake, then I think it would be fair to make India pay to the uttermost farthing everything that it could be shown was due to Britain's rule over India. But I cannot but feel that England's interest—or Britain's interest—in keeping India under British rule is enormous. India affords employment to thousands of Britons, India employs millions of British capital,

and Indian commerce has been of immense value to Great Britain. Therefore it seems to me that India being held by Great Britain not only for India's sake but for Great Britain's sake, the latter should pay a share of the expenditure for the purpose. And in estimating what that share should be, I think that England should behave generously to India, because, in the first place, England is a rich country, and India is a poor country."

British
Apathy.

SIR CHARLES DILKE's speech on the Indian Budget was, as usual, one of the few useful contributions to the debate. The great obstacle to Indian reform is in truth

"ignorance of facts rather than any desire on the part of the people to avert their eyes from these facts. . . . The fact that everybody had had the opportunity of reading the whole financial statement of India naturally deprived this occasion (the Budget debate) of the interest it would otherwise have."

The remedy is to make the discussion of Indian finance a real discussion, like that which takes place on the British Budget. There are comparatively few men who can feel any keen interest in a debate of which the sole issue must be rather academic expressions of approval or disapproval, followed by none of the consequences attaching to a Government victory or defeat on home affairs. Even the House of Commons can furnish only a limited number of minds having sufficient foresight to envisage the probable consequences to the empire of the present tendency of Indian administration. British constitutional history teaches us that no grievance except financial injustice ever roused the people's representatives to determined opposition. Until British electors are compelled to contribute to Imperial expenditure in India there is small hope that they will take much trouble to learn the facts or to modify through their representatives the course of Indian government. At the same time there are many members of Parliament—especially men who have imbibed the usual Anglo-Indian prejudices—who think with Colonel Sandys that:

"It is dangerous for the House of Commons to interfere much with the Government of India. The wisest thing that can be done, both for the people of India and for this country, is to leave India as much as possible to the Secretary of State, the Governor-General, and the Council."

With this precious plea for bureaucratic irresponsibility as a counsel of perfection we may compare the sapience of *Vanity Fair*, which observed on August 5:

"If India is to be in a state of tranquillity the Government have no time to waste with the Radical. Indeed, the more he protests the further we must go. Fortunately the House of Commons will soon have closed its doors, and Conservative good work will not suffer much Radical interruption."

The value of such remarks consists in the resentment which they provoke. There is at present, let

us not forget, no check upon Anglo-Indian bureaucracy except that which the action of public opinion, especially public opinion in England, may supply.

THE inevitable reference to increase of population in India was introduced into the Secretary of State's Budget speech to explain in part the prevalent distress. "Over-population" serves as a convenient excuse for various failures on the part of the authorities to grapple successfully with pressing social problems. But "over-population," like "over-production," is a term which requires careful explanation and limitation. Its ordinary use involves a fallacy. The fallacy implied in the popular notion of "over-production" has long ago been exploded. But "over-population" is still a fetish to which many lives are annually sacrificed. It is true, no doubt, that temporarily, and in limited areas, demand for food may exceed supply, and suffering naturally ensues. Yet economic law teaches us that food is naturally diverted towards the locality where it finds a good market. Similarly, in the event of a sudden blow to a great industry, much suffering is entailed before the necessary diversion of labour takes place. The evil in both cases is due to the lack of immediately available capital, without which the action of the economic law is impossible. India has land and labour in plenty. In normal years her productiveness is sufficient to supply the wants not merely of her present population, but of millions besides. The increase of population which intervenes between the period of distress and actual famine in no wise vitiates the argument, although it increases the difficulty of coping with famine. The pestilence which almost invariably accompanies or follows famine naturally sweeps off the weakly famine offspring first. Even if this were not so—and charitable endeavour comes in to prevent it—yet the argument from the abnormal condition would be unfair. India lacks the third requisite for the production of wealth, namely, capital. English gold has been poured into the country, to be wasted largely on unproductive purposes. On the other hand, the financial policy of the Government has resulted in a constant drain on Indian resources, and suitable outlets and conditions are wanting for the profitable employment of such native hoards as exist. Until these hoards are employed they cannot, of course, be considered capital in the economic sense. There is still room for agricultural expansion, and much more room for industrial development in India, if conditions were created favourable enough to enable Indian industries to meet the severe competition of the East. Meanwhile, to speak of "over-population" with

reference to frugal, industrious workers like the Indian races is merely an attempt to transfer to the governed the responsibility for a state of things for which the Government is largely to blame. We cannot do better than add the following passage from Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt's article upon "Famines and their Remedy," which appeared in the August *Fortnightly* :—

"Much has been said of the increase of population in India. But India is not the only country in which population increases. The population of the British Islands was twenty-five millions when the Queen ascended the throne; it is now forty millions, not counting ten millions more who have found homes beyond the seas. The population of India, excluding annexations, has not increased at this rate. On the other hand, trade and commerce have increased in India, railways and canals have been opened, immense wastes have been brought under cultivation, and the resources of the country have been wonderfully developed during these sixty years. The increase of population has not been greater than the development of her resources. The increase in population affords no explanation, therefore, for the recurring famines of India. Let us have done with such generalisations, and go to the root of the matter. Let us, or those of us who can do so, mark the condition of the Indian cultivator in his home, and find out what causes impoverish him and make him unable to save. The reason is not a want of frugality, or of sobriety, or of prudence. The Indian peasant is the most sober, the most frugal, and the most prudent peasant on the face of the earth. The reason is, that at each settlement the rent payable by him is increased and his capacity to save is decreased. The reason is that, with no savings of his own, he goes to the money-lender under every pressure, and our Civil Courts, with their hard-and-fast rules, only cast him deeper into the meshes of the grasping money-lender. The reason is that in every petty dispute, civil and criminal, he is compelled to have recourse to distant and expensive law courts. The reason is that he has to pay many taxes in order to maintain England's Empire in Asia."

THE debate on the Budget left in suspense the timely and important proposal that a special grant from Imperial funds should be made to India to help in the alleviation of destitution. This proposal, which has been current during the past six months, and has been urged again and again in these columns, was introduced into the discussion by Mr. Samuel Smith.

"Help (he said) was needed for the suffering masses of the people of India at present. Our country was prosperous, our Colonies were prosperous. We were congratulating ourselves on the greatness of the Empire. But over our huge Indian possessions, containing the largest population, hung the greatest gloom and misery. Could we do nothing in this Jubilee year to alleviate this? He appealed to the Government and to the House to make a special grant to India in this time of awful need. . . . What better use could we make of one or two millions than to devote such a sum to the alleviation of the misery in India? It would be the most worthy celebration of the Jubilee year. It would do more to appease discontent in India than any number of press prosecutions. Parliament would approve of it, it would be popular in this country, and he was sure it would be a wise thing to do politi-

cally. . . . What they required was some fund which could be applied for the benefit of the peasantry after the famine was over so as to give them a fresh start. He thought that £2,000,000 could be so applied as to confer immense benefits upon India, and that it would touch the hearts of the people of that country as nothing else had done."

Sir Andrew Scoble "associated himself" with Mr. Samuel Smith's suggestion. "The famine," he said, "was not anywhere near at an end, nor was its effect, and he would like very much to see a handsome sum placed at the disposal of the Government of India by a substantial money grant." Why, one is inclined to ask, drag in the "Government" of India? What is wanted is rather a sum to be placed at the disposal of some competent body representing the people of India. It is pleasant to find that even Sir Henry Fowler spoke in favour of the proposal, which he supported with a passage, previously cited in INDIA, from an eloquent speech by the Maharājā of Darbhanga. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to whom Sir H. Fowler appealed by name, sat silent, and no hint came from the Front Bench that the proposal would be adopted. If it should be refused, Lord George Hamilton and his colleagues will have added another to the long list of their blunders in dealing with India.

WHEN the Secretary of State for India permits himself the use of language which virtually prejudices the issue of an important case still *sub judice*, it is not surprising that the average newspaper should give the question-begging heading "Sedition in India" to telegrams about the Poona prosecutions, and write of "Tilak" as if he were a convict or a deceased person of admitted eminence. Mr. Tilak is expected to be tried early in the present month for seditious writing, and until the result of the trial is known it is only decent to refrain from comment upon it. Meanwhile Professor Gokhale, who made the serious mistake of repeating on the authority of correspondents an accusation that those correspondents have not substantiated, has withdrawn the accusation and apologised for it. Sir W. Wedderburn, whose personal explanation to his constituents will be found on another page, has also apologised in the House of Commons for having "directly or indirectly aided in giving currency" to the accusation. This matter, however, should not be allowed to obscure the Poona Memorial of May 10, which we printed in our last issue. Lord George Hamilton said in his recent Budget speech:—

"The only methods by which the growth of the plague could be arrested were repugnant to the instincts, customs, and usages of the great mass of the native population, and they interfered with the privacy of their home life. . . . The Government had no choice but to do their best to stamp out the plague, and the only method by which plague can be so

eradicated is by the segregation of the sick and house-to-house visitation. Both these principles came into contact with the hereditary customs and traditions of Oriental life."

The Poona Memorial went a little further than this and alleged that in Poona, as distinguished from Bombay, needless violence has been done to the customs and traditions of Oriental life. That Memorial, we must point out, has not yet been disposed of. Needless to say, the telegram which Lord G. Hamilton read to the House of Commons on August 5, did not dispose of it. The telegram said that of 1,699 signatures to the Memorial, 721 had been examined, and that of these 721 only 144 could be traced. It thereupon proceeded to deal with the 144, of which 14 were denied by the persons whose signatures they professed to be. It is not difficult to conceive circumstances under which such denials might easily be made. But what of the other signatures—the 978 signatures which with 721 make up the total of 1699? In the absence of full enquiry we cannot believe that the Memorial was a mere fiction, for we have before us a series of signed statements put in by many of the signatories. The pity of it is, as we have said before, that full enquiry was not immediately made into the allegations when the Memorial was received by the Government of Bombay.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY IN PRACTICE.

I.—By PROFESSOR A. F. MURSON, LL.D.

The rising in the Swat valley appears to have communicated, or disclosed, a feeling of unrest along the frontier as far as the Kurram Pass, involving the Mohmands, the Afridis, and the Orakzais. The danger, direct and indirect, is sufficiently obvious; but the true estimate of it in England is not likely to be assisted by the official reports from Simla, and still less by the foolish commentary of irresponsible journalism. The fact that some forty thousand troops are standing to arms, with further preparation in the background, is sufficiently eloquent. It is very silly to wire home from Bombay that "the frontier is now absolutely secure against the worst that can possibly happen." The frontier is always absolutely secure from external attacks, whencesoever and whatsoever, so long at least as India itself is loyal. Any disquiet on that score is perfectly gratuitous, and the suggestion of it is mere thoughtlessness, ignorance, or excitability. The putting down of the rising, whatever its extent, is a mere question of time and men and money. The pity is, that the general ignorance of the facts of the situation gives rise to an apparent anxiety, which, although in no sense justifiable, only too readily suggests an Imperial weakness and self-distrust for which there is not an atom of foundation, but which may still encourage futile hopes that it may be an expensive business to thwart, as thwarted they must infallibly be. To misunderstand this bottom fact is the sheerest folly.

There is no lack of danger in the question of the origin of the trouble. There is no doubt whatever that many Indian Muhammadans have taken to heart the harsh treatment that they consider England has recently applied to the Sultan of Turkey—a view that is perhaps intelligible on the religious ground. But it is tolerably certain that no such feelings have prompted the rising in the Swat valley, whatever influence they may exercise in possible developments. There is far more difficulty in the question of the responsibility of the Amīr of Afghanistan. The *Times*, with mischievous brusqueness and unfriendliness, concludes that there is no reasonable doubt as to his complicity. It is easy enough to attach a false importance to the coincident withdrawal of the Amīr's commercial agents from Calcutta (or Simla), Bombay, and Karachi; and to interpret "commercial" in the sense it has always borne in the Central Asian diplomacy of Russia. It may, or may not, be the case that the Amīr issued his orders for peace on the frontier before such action was required of him by the friendly communication from Simla; but it is well-known that the frontier tribes in question, though politically within his jurisdiction, do not in the best of times pay any more attention to his commands than happens to suit their uncertain humour. The presence of Afghans among the enemy in recent actions would be a very natural circumstance, and tells against the Amīr only on positive proofs of his complicity drawn from other sources. Even the alleged fact that the Hadda Mullah, who preached a *jehād* among the tribes in the vicinity of Peshawar, stands high in the favour of the Amīr, needs to be handled with much caution. The danger is, that incidental points—rumours, assumptions, inferences, or even minor facts—may divert attention from the two solid and fundamental considerations, that the Amīr (1) is no fool, and (2) knows remarkably well on which side his bread is buttered.

It is not necessary to go to Constantinople or to Cabul in order to discover an adequate explanation of the Swati rising. Chitral is enough; although it may of course be only the occasion. On the wild pretext of taking precautions against Russian invasion by the Boroghil Pass, or against possible Russian intermeddling with the Chitrali tribes, we occupied Chitral, and insisted on an open road through the Swat valley. The evil vaticinations of the Liberals were officially met with the startling declaration that the local tribes were beseeching us to stay and refusing to be happy till we should definitively establish ourselves in their country. After all, the Liberal contention seems to have been the truer one. No doubt, formally, we leave the tribes in possession of their lands, we refrain from interference with their organisation or their peaceful customs, and we even recognise services in cash payments. But, notwithstanding all this, our presence there imposes irksome restraints and offends the spirit of independence inborn and imbued in mountaineers. It pleases some of us to speak of these populations as fanatics. It is fanatical this and fanatical that. But alter the point of view, and we at once alter the adjective. It would be rather funny to speak of Sir William Wallace, or of

Schamyl, as a fanatic; yet we do not think it odd to apply the term, with an implied explanation of an objectionable state of facts, to the Mahdi, or Osman Digna, or the "Mad" Mullah, even though such inferior creatures be "rightly struggling to be free." The Anglo-Saxon hide, swollen firm by self-regarding superiority, is wonderfully indurated. These peoples are most naturally irritated by the very presence of strangers within their boundaries; and the English are not usually known as unaggressive or conciliatory strangers. The tribes cannot but feel that their lands and liberties are every moment in danger; they cannot be expected to understand that our word is our bond; but it costs them no effort to conceive that the strong man, who has already taken something from them, may at any moment take all the rest they possess. The very situation speaks for itself.

The question is, therefore, forced back on us: why should we go beyond our own boundaries and set up inevitable irritation among peoples that we really and earnestly want to remain at peace? It is the old question of the frontier policy. The Forward policy, which has vexed India, which has been the main danger to our Indian Empire for the last twenty years, is responsible, and solely responsible, for these troubles, and for all that may eventually develop in their train. It is undoubtedly true that, if we stay within our boundary and leave the tribes to do as they like, we shall now and again be vexed by hot-headed incursions; but that is comparatively a small affair, and each account is easily settled. This is no matter of academic speculation; it is proved by the experience of the period of "masterly inactivity" (a much misunderstood designation, by the way). On the other hand, the Forward policy has involved us, not only in constant broils, but in struggles of a considerably extensive and exceedingly costly character. The strange thing is, that this policy should carry it with such a high hand, in the teeth of its obvious consequences, when it is disowned by almost every statesman and every military authority of real importance. The fact is, that the civil powers in India are too weak to keep the active military powers in proper check; and there is no adequate electoral opinion controlling the authorities in England. The spirit of the great god Jingo is, therefore, rampant; and one day, depend upon it, we shall have to pay dearly for our slackness. The battle of these policies cannot be fought over again in the present article, but it may be at least suggestive to look back to 1874-75, and see the conditions that were in Sir Henry Rawlinson's mind, some seven years after the date of his famous "Memorandum." In considering summarily the general question preliminarily to suggesting "what should be our policy in the future," Sir Henry wrote as follows:

"Our position in India is strong and flourishing. The social condition of the people is rapidly improving. The revenue is increasing. New paths of industry are being opened up, in the advantages of which the governors and the governed equally participate. The interests, indeed, of the two classes are becoming identified. Education in the meantime is spreading—perhaps too rapidly. Crime is being repressed, and even-handed justice is everywhere advanced. Since the mutiny, insurrection has been rendered impossible, and the embers of

discontent, even in some of the native States, are hardly to be seen; not that the elements of mischief are extinct, but they are checked for the time by moral and material prosperity."

Now, we venture to ask, can it be imagined that a material alteration of these conditions would not have led to a material reconsideration of the policy Sir Henry based upon them? Just consider the points, one by one. Is our position in India to-day strong? Is it flourishing? Is the social condition of the people rapidly improving? On the contrary, is it free from elements that justly may be considered disquieting? Is the revenue really increasing? And are the methods of such increase consistent with health in the body politic? Are new paths of industry being opened up? If so, please specify them. On the contrary, are not the old industries of the country either decaying or actually destroyed, by the progress of Western civilisation, and are not the new industries to engage the populations in their place still to seek? Is it true that the interests of the two classes are becoming identified? On the contrary, does not the question sound diabolically sarcastic? Education is spreading, perhaps too rapidly—is it? On the contrary, is it not the case that, having given the education, we not only refuse to utilise it, but we carefully close up the avenues for its natural utilisation, and suffer for—or at least complain bitterly of—its misdirection? Crime is certainly repressed: here at least is one solitary condition untouched, or perhaps even improved, since 1874-75. Is even-handed justice everywhere administered? Yes, again; but with the very important qualification that the methods are gravely in need of thorough revision. Is insurrection no longer possible? Well, to be accurate, the Mutiny was not exactly an insurrection, but a much milder visitation, and in fact generically distinct. But what Sir Henry possibly means is, a successful insurrection; and that is not now, perhaps, possible, although an unsuccessful insurrection is only less to be deprecated. Is it true that the embers of discontent are hardly to be seen? and are the native states the present-day exception? What of possible embers that smoulder unseen, till called into lurid glare by some chance occasion not to be forecast? Where are the vaunted checks of moral and material prosperity?

We take leave to commend such elementary considerations to the champions and supporters of this cruel and impotent Forward Policy. There is scarcely a single condition of those relied on by Sir Henry Rawlinson that can be safely trusted at the present moment; yet our governors are content to go on the exploded tradition, with the safety and prosperity of the Indian empire in their hands. It is the delusion that precedes destruction. Our sole stay in India is the moral and material prosperity of the people. The chief menace to such prosperity comes from the financial mischief, with all the hurtful elements in its operation, which penetrate throughout society. The main cause of the financial trouble is this preposterous frontier policy. Such are the links in the chain of disaster that is so laboriously forging. With India prosperous and justly treated, and therefore content, there is no human power now visible that need cause us the loss

of a single hour's sleep out of concern for the frontier. The frontier tribes, the Amír, the White Tser—not a living man of them could ever debouch on Indian territory in the face of an English army within the frontier lines. But, with India unprosperous and justly discontented, the situation is transformed. The Sibyl has already presented her books; she presents them again to-day with higher terms. To-morrow the terms will again rise, and the offer will be the last. Then—what of the day after?

II.—BY J. DACOSTA.

Recent telegrams have disclosed a state of active hostilities beyond the North-Western frontier of India, the cause of which official utterances and semi-official organs have ascribed to the preaching of fanatical priests, which has excited the Afghan tribes to rise against the English; while an examination of the incidents reported and a review of the events which have led to the present situation show those hostilities to be the result of our invasion of independent tribal territories, and of our attempts, by fortifying ourselves therein, to subjugate and include them in our Empire in pursuance of the "scientific" or "advanced frontier" policy, in the execution of which so much blood and treasure has already been expended by India since 1876.

The present troubles commenced by the public at home being startled on June 11 by a telegram saying: "Defeat of an Indian frontier force; English officers killed or wounded." The next morning the *Times* declared, upon information received from Simla, that no cause could be assigned for the tribal attack on the British force which had entered tribal territory in the Tochi Valley, in order to establish a military post in it. The writer omitted to mention that the territory had been entered by us in opposition to the manifest wishes of the tribesmen, and that we based our right to occupy it on an agreement which we had induced Abdur Rahman to make with us in consideration of our adding 600,000 rupees to the annual subsidy which he has been receiving from India ever since 1860; the tribesmen whose territory was concerned being themselves no party to the agreement, and our argument for concluding it being based on the ground that the tribesmen were not subjects of the Amír, but independent tribes governed by their elected chiefs, and paying no regular revenue to the Amír. And our agreement having provided merely that the Amír should afford no material assistance to the border tribes in their opposition to our attempts to bring them under our rule, it seems irrational under such conditions for us to claim the submission of the tribes. Three years ago, when we failed under similar circumstances to subjugate the Mahads in Waziristan, we sent troops to occupy the Tochi Valley, the local tribes distinctly manifesting their opposition to our intrusion; and as they have since observed our determination to fortify ourselves in their country, their attack on the body sent by us in June was to oppose the complete invasion and subjugation of their territory.

The next incident in the present disturbances was

the night attack made by local tribes on Malakand in the Swat Valley, a place which we had forcibly occupied during our Chitral expedition, assuring the tribes by a proclamation of our Viceroy that we should not permanently occupy any part of the tribal territories which our Chitral force had to traverse in order to reach their destination. When the tribes observed that after two years we still held Malakand and were fortifying ourselves there, they could not but look upon our action as a violation of the pledge given in our proclamation, and their present attack has obviously therefore no other motive but to liberate their territory of the presence of our troops.

On July 31 when Lord Reay, referring to Lord George Hamilton's statement that the attack was due to the preaching of a priest, expressed a hope that if there were any other causes, they would be communicated to Parliament, he was told in reply that it was impossible for the Government to make a statement of the causes without enquiries, which could not be conducted whilst the fighting continued. The next day, however, a telegram stated that it had for some time been known to our political agents that a rising was intended, and that precautions were taken; and it seems incredible that Government should not then have instituted effectual enquiries into the cause of the intended attack. The reply given to Lord Reay must therefore be assumed to imply the unwillingness of the Government to afford the information asked for.

A later incident is the attack made by tribesmen from the Mohmand country on the British garrison of the fort at Shahkadr, eighteen miles north of Peshawar, and of their burning the neighbouring village of Shaktargarh. A strong relief force marched from Peshawar, and the concentration of two additional reserve brigades were ordered at the same time, the requisite troops being drawn from the rest of India, even from the Madras and Bombay presidencies.

Parliament having been prorogued before the attack from the Mohmands was reported, no question as to its cause could be asked of Government, and the British action find themselves committed to a war fully as great, judging from the number of troops mobilised, as the Afghan war of 1878-80, while they are kept in ignorance of its cause and its motive. The situation seems unconstitutional, seeing that the supplies have been obtained from the revenues of India without the consent of Parliament, and that the Executive are waging this war without having justified it to the representatives of the British nation. It becomes a duty under these circumstances carefully to scrutinize the causes of the war and to estimate its perils, in order to ascertain how best to avert those perils. This may perhaps be facilitated by a review of the following facts.

The influential statesmen who devised our Afghan war of 1878-80 professed to believe that the Russian advance in Central Asia involved a menace and a danger to our Indian possessions, which the subjugation of Afghanistan and its military occupation alone would ward off. The groundlessness of the fears expressed and the inexpediency of undertaking

a second invasion of Afghanistan were clearly demonstrated by officers of great ability and experience, including the great Duke of Wellington and the present Lord Roberts. But the party who schemed for the war appear to have been encouraged by the great improvements introduced in our armaments of war, and of our army generally since the previous invasion, and may also have been blinded, perhaps, by the military glory which the achievement of so difficult a task as the subjugation of Afghanistan would shed on the British nation; and war was then determinately resolved upon. A *caveat* *lest*, however, was wanting, as our relations with the Amir, Sher Ali, had been of the most friendly character, and the Viceroy was therefore directed to find a pretext to force on the Amir a British mission, in contravention to our repeated promises. Lord Northbrook, however, demurred and retired, and a more compliant Viceroy was then found, willing to foment a quarrel on the Amir; whereupon three British armies invaded his kingdom from different directions. The hope of redeeming the disasters suffered in the war of 1839-42 doubtless encouraged our second invasion; but the hope was not realized, and the conditions on which our troops withdrew from that inhospitable land after the unsuccessful war, 1878-80, were indeed lamentable, and unworthy of a great nation. The people and Parliament of Great Britain then perceived that those who had led them into a second disastrous conflict with our neighbours were not worthy of their confidence, and the Cabinet was accordingly defeated at the general election in 1880, and had to retire. Matters then improved in India; but in 1885 the Irish claim for Home Rule led to violent political contests at home, which eventually restored to power the statesmen who had been responsible for the war of 1878-80; and they have ever since endeavoured to vindicate their condemned policy by fresh attempts to achieve the subjugation of Afghanistan. They accordingly increased H.M.'s Indian army, and modified their strategic policy by resolving on subjugating the border tribes of Afghanistan before attacking the kingdom of the Amir in order to construct military roads through their territories so as to maintain communications with any British army which should afterwards invade the kingdom of Afghanistan.

THE DEBATE ON THE INDIAN BUDGET.

I.—LORD GEORGE HAMILTON'S STATEMENT.

By H. MORGAN-DAWSON.

It has never fallen to our lot to listen to a sadder or more confused statement on Indian Finance than that with which Lord George Hamilton opened the House of Commons on August 5 last. It may be admitted at once that circumstances were unpropitious—they nearly always are on Indian Budget night. The Indian Budget is always the herald of the close of the Session, but as a rule some sort of shamefaced apology is made for this frequent neglect of Imperial duties. This year the business was altogether shameful. The First Lord of the Treasury made it the subject of a cynical jest—"We

shall adhere carefully to precedent" he informed a smoking House a day or two before the debate—while the Secretary of State for India brought to bear all his unrivalled powers of commonplace oratory upon a subject of which he displayed his wonted ignorance. Nothing was more obvious than that the Secretary of State in his halting exposition was repeating a half-learned lesson by the aid of imperfectly understood notes. So little was he master of his subject that on more than one occasion he mixed up millions and thousands in unconscious confusion. Nor was the element of burlesque absent from the grievous farce. That ridiculous person Sir Mancherjee Bhownagjee ostentatiously took the Government of India under his protection. With the seal of a renegade he attacked Sir William Wedderburn in such grotesque, albeit vulgar, terms that the House fairly roared at the funny little man who modelled his periods on Burke and his sentiments on a fifth-rate tub-thumper, from whose published stump-operations he had evidently drawn abundant inspiration.

To deal more particularly with the financial complications of Lord George Hamilton. The first thing to note is the growing gravity of the financial situation in India. Compared with the accounts and estimates put forward only a few weeks ago in the Government of India's Financial Statement, and the Secretary of State's explanatory memorandum, the position is changed immeasurably for the worse. Here was the position as shown in the explanatory memorandum, dated India Office, July 10, 1897:—

	Accounts, 1895-96. Rx.	Revised Estimate, 1896-1897. Rx.	Budget Estimate, 1897-98. Rx.
Net Revenue ..	62,542,085	58,034,200	59,029,700
Net Expenditure..	61,008,087	60,021,100	62,093,700
Surplus (+) or Deficit (—) ..	+1,533,998	—1,986,900	—2,464,000

Here is the position as revealed by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons, August 5, 1897:—

	Accounts, 1895-96. Rx.	Revised Estimate, 1896-97. Rx.	Budget Estimate, 1897-98. Rx.
Surplus (+) or Deficit (—) ..	+1,533,998	—1,593,500	—3,924,000

This is a further deterioration of over a crore of rupees for the last two years, made up of an improvement of nearly Rx. 400,000 in the Revised Estimate for 1896-97, and a further deterioration of Rx. 1,460,000 in the Budget for the current year. Of this additional drain for the current year only Rx. 400,000 is ascribed to the famine, and no less than Rx. 730,000—exactly one-half—is the estimated cost of the Tochi and Malakand military operations. Of course, Lord George Hamilton was not unduly depressed—your Indian official is a veritable Mark Tapley, except when a falling exchange offers him a convenient cloak for official extravagance. What did he say, then? Why, he appealed to exchange forthwith. "Against this may be put a rise in exchange," were his sapient words. Let us pause for a moment to contemplate so much simplicity. Chitral cost 1½ millions. It was paid for by a rise

in exchange. The Government's breach of faith has already cost another three-quarters of a million. No matter; it will be paid for by a rise in exchange. Just so. When exchange falls, the Government excuse deficits as due to forces beyond their control. But when exchange rises, are they going to squander their good fortune in wiping out deficits, or in contributing to a calamity like the famine? Not they. It comes in handy to pay for military promenades on the frontier.

In this connexion we may recall the wise words of that eminent statesman—Sir Lepel Griffin—whom a few of his admirers have been assiduously puffing in the press as the desirable Viceroy at the next vacancy. Sir Lepel informed the inevitable interviewer that these little frontier expeditions were such good training for our troops, that really it might become necessary to provoke them if the frontier tribes would not oblige. How admirably this kind of statesmanship would fit in with Lord George Hamilton's notions on finance. Let us see how it might work out in practice.

Telegram from Viceroy.—Troops getting stale. Want exercise. Shall we raise the border?

Telegram from Secretary of State.—You must ask Westland about Exchange. What is it worth on this Budget?

Telegram from Viceroy.—Exchange better by one crore.

Telegram from Secretary of State.—All right. Fire away. But don't exceed one crore.

But the thing grows too serious. This three-quarters of a million was the estimate a month ago. With the whole border aflame and the hasty mobilisation of 30,000 or 40,000 men where is that estimate now? We feel confident that the recent development of events on the North-West Frontier will be found to have already added another crore to the latest estimate. Consequently by this time the original deficit of two-and-a-half millions for the current year may be now estimated at something like double that amount, or five millions. Where is this kind of thing going to end?

The other point in Lord George Hamilton's statement which calls for comment, is his contention that the famine and plague will have cost Rx. 12,000,000 in the two years 1896-7—1897-8. As the expenditure on account of the plague is not shown separately, we may take it that it is not of itself of a budget-destroying character. Practically, Lord George Hamilton means that the Famine will have cost Rx. 12,000,000 for the two years, and that this being so it is a remarkable tribute to the economy of the Indian Government and the elasticity of revenues that in those two years there should be only accumulated deficit of some Rx. 4,500,000 without the imposition of fresh taxation—or taking the figures in his Budget statement, an accumulated deficit of Rx. 8,500,000. But how does he make out that the famine is costing Rx. 12,000,000? At page 5 of the Secretary of State's memorandum, there is a table showing the increased charge for famine in 1896-7 as compared with the original Budget estimate for that year. That table shows a net increased charge for famine in 1896-7 of Rx. 5,034,100 on imperial account and of Rx. 674,700 on provincial

account. At page 6 of the same publication there is a similar statement for 1897-8, showing a total deterioration attributable to famine of Rx. 4,176,300. From these statements it would appear that the cost to the Imperial Government—which alone affects the Imperial surplus or deficit—is Rx. 9,200,000 instead of Rx. 12,000,000. But the details of this estimate are not very clear although the total of nine crores may be fairly correct. In the first place it seems to be made up by treating every falling off in revenue as compared with a Budget estimate (now Budget estimates are notoriously untrustworthy—Finance ministers themselves say so, and they ought to know) as a loss caused by the famine. But increases of revenue are not treated as a set off to such deterioration. In the next place, taking the year 1896-7, there is an increase of net expenditure in Railways of Rx. 1,234,200 claimed to be due to famine and a reduction of net expenditure on railways of Rx. 197,200, which is not treated as a set-off. How can there be both an increase and a reduction of net expenditure? What kind of financial juggling is this? It is impossible, therefore, to feel confidence in this particular estimate.

There remains the question, what is the probable loss to the Government of India caused by the famine? We can best arrive at this by comparing the estimates for 1896-7 and 1897-8 with the accounts of 1895-96. In this way we start from a solid basis of realised fact and not from the errors and uncertainties of an estimate. Decrease of revenue under certain heads and certain increases of expenditure may be fairly attributed to the famine. But because an estimate of increase of revenue, perhaps extravagant, has not been fully realised, it is ridiculous to cry "Famine." For instance, a loss of Rx. 50,000 in net Forest revenue is put down to the famine, although there was an actual increase of over Rx. 100,000 in net Forest revenue for 1896-7 (Revised Estimate) as compared with the Accounts of 1895-96. Taking 1895-6 (Accounts) as our basis, the following may perhaps be fairly claimed as the cost of the famine.

NET COST OF FAMINE.

IN 1896-7.		Rx.
Loss of Land Revenue	2,505,500	
" Salt	423,200	
" Excise	116,500	
" Provincial Rates	164,800	

Total loss of Revenue	3,210,000
Increase of Famine Relief	1,426,000
Loss of Receipts on Railways	1,700,000
Saving on cost of Irrigation	- 626,000

Total increase of Expenditure 2,500,000

Cost of Famine for 1896-7 .. Rx 5,710,000

IN 1897-98.		Rx.
Loss of Land Revenue	549,000	
" Salt	127,000	
" Excise	46,000	
" Provincial Rates	80,000	

Total loss of Revenue 802,000

Increase of Famine Relief	8,080,000
Loss of Receipts on Railways	1,175,000
Saving on cost of Irrigation	- 626,000

Total Increase of Expenditure 8,629,000

Cost of Famine for 1897-8 .. Rx. 4,377,000

Net cost of Famine for the two years .. Rx. 10,087,000

Deduct portion borne by Provincial Governments, say .. 1,087,000

Rx. 9,000,000

Seeing that this estimate would show a total loss of railway receipts in the two years of nearly Rx. 3,000,000 against a little over Rx. 2,000,000 estimated by the Government of India it is certainly not an understatement of the probable cost of the famine. Yet it is in substantial agreement as to the total with the estimate at pages 5 and 6 of the explanatory Memorandum, and like it is some Rx. 3,000,000 short of the amount stated by the Secretary of State in his Budget speech to be the cost of the famine. This estimate also attributes every rupee of deterioration under certain heads of revenue to the Famine. Where then does that Rx. 12,000,000 come from? On the whole we see no ground to suppose that nine crores is not a sufficiently liberal estimate of the cost of the famine to the Imperial Government.

Of course this nine crores is a heavy burden; but in the first place we must remember that by the Famine Insurance Fund the Government had been preparing for just such an emergency, and in the second place that during the last three years a rising Exchange has been bountifully adding to its resources. Compared with 1894-5, only two years ago, Exchange is costing less by Rx. 3,000,000 in each of the years 1896-7 and 1897-8. Consequently towards this burden of the Famine Exchange contributes no less than two-thirds of the cost; leaving only Rs. 3,000,000 in two years as the cost of calamities unredeemed by counterbalancing good fortune. And yet instead of three crores the deficits for the two years threaten to amount to five and a-half crores. And still the Government of India boasts that the deficits are not greater than they are!

II.—BY W. M. J. WILLIAMS.

Sir H. Fowler is the despair of his friends when he turns his official side to them as he did again on August 5. With half-averted glance, he speaks on Indian affairs in the tottering accents of bureaucracy. No one can well forget that this is the "year of calamity" in India. But one trusts there are many whose political ears will perceive the discord between the pæan of the ex-Secretary and the gloomy and jarring financial statement of the Secretary for India. Sir H. Fowler spoke (in equivocal phrase) of the story of British administration in India as the "most wondrous in history." Lord George Hamilton spoke of India in the year of the Diamond Jubilee as stricken with famine, plague and earthquake; with finances in dire straits, becom-

ing worse since the estimate for the current year was made; taxed so that at the approach of recurring famine nothing was left but to remit taxes, pay current expenses from loans, and those loans in turn increasingly drawn, not from India, but from London. Sir H. Fowler counts the achievements, and they are many of a kind. But they do not include a satisfactory moral or material condition of the people, though battles have been won and territory enlarged. Lord George Hamilton stands, not statuesquely, yet as lifeless as a statue almost, with his eyes to dark and heavy clouds, and he mumbles of problems—finishes his dismal story with problems, whether the clouds all round will break in cruel storms or pass away, leaving a time of light and hope. The last words were, the clouds! the clouds! And, looking at the present position, the economic, the sanitary position, the ruin by "acts of God," and now the intelligibly mystic outbursts of the tribes in the far North-West, who will doubt that the uninspiring Secretary of State was the more faithful artist, however sombre his picture?

Sir H. Fowler found the Budget debate in the Commons "lively," with an oblique reference probably to some of the suggestions made during the evening. He complimented all and sundry, the Secretary of State, the Viceroy, and all who rule in India for the way in which they have faced the difficulties of the day, and in so doing he undoubtedly expressed what the severest critics would gladly say on fitting occasion. To dot Lord George's i's and cross his t's is nevertheless, to many, a very unsatisfactory thing—too optimistic on the face of Lord George's own statement, which was in tone and substance an *apologia*. In adducing some chief points, one is at the outset tempted to touch upon the evidence given of the stagey presentation of affairs by the remarks on the provincial settlements and the perennial struggle for funds between the local and the central authorities in India. Lord George Hamilton can see the necessity of checking local expenditure in India by local financial responsibility, while stoically encouraging at home that growth of subventions from the central coffer. This was but one of the many signs of the priming he had endured before appearing as an exponent of finance. But other parts of the statement do not contain such unexceptionable financial principles. The *apologia* was curiously involved. One can sympathise with disappointment over the disappearance of the "realised surpluses" which the Finance Minister had planned in succession, but which were washed away into a grand wreck by "meteorological phenomena." Are there not evidences also that surpluses may not, shall not, flourish in India? Take the Secretary's remark in his brief *résumé* of the 1895-6 Accounts that they show a surplus of Rs. 1,533,000, though they contain the whole cost of the Chitral campaign. The suggestion is inevitable that when famine and plague do not require the money, then a campaign on some distant border will somehow appear in time to check too vigorous a development of surpluses and a consequent policy of reduction of taxation or payment of debt. A case in point, too, is the remark on the 1897-8 Estimates, where Lord George's brief required the mention of the virtuous

reduction of Rs. 100,000 on Army Expenditure. Before the words were spoken in Parliament they required emendation with reference to the cost of the "expeditionary forces in the Tochi Valley and Malakand." One marks the financial ill-luck that dogs the footsteps of the Administration. That ill-luck is not wholly accidental—is not free from considerations which point to the Government's responsibility. Lord George, speaking of the triennial period 1895-6 and 1897-8, uses the phrase "extraordinary expenditure thrust upon us," and it is a good specimen of the studied assumption of innocent policy. The innocence is partly justifiable, as referring to the financial issues of famine and plague. But expenditure in the main is dependent on policy, and it will not do to class all the Chitrala, the Tochi, and the Malakanda and such enterprises, with the crores involved for them, as visitations for which the policy of the Government is in no wise responsible. The cake has been eaten, and the cost of it has to be paid—by instalments. To speak of "deficits very much less than the extraordinary expenditure thrust upon us" may be a triumph of commercial wisdom and diplomacy. But it is poor cover for an extravagant policy, and for finance which trusts to benefits from an improved exchange—all swallowed up, as it appears, and all insufficient without heavy borrowing. Then, again, couple here the fact, so lightly dropped out of the box of puzzles, that at the last moment the Rs. 4,000,000 proposed to be raised in 1897-8 in India at 3 per cent., and £4,500,000 in London, had to be modified into *three* crores in India at 3½ per cent., and the balance of the, say, £8,000,000 in London at the market rate. India cannot lend any more even though 3½ is offered for it. Then, of course, it was inevitable that the famine fund of railway lines should be thrown into the balance, and there can be no doubt that the railway system has been of great assistance in combating the wide-spreading arms of famine and death. But they only enable us also to travel more speedily to the bottom of the question of India's economic condition. The insurance does not insure from dire suffering. When the famine comes, and we are informed that it is unavoidable, there is nothing upon which to fall back. Officialism had to confess reluctantly that English charity was needed to combat the foe, and now, again, the Indian Secretary informs the House of Commons, that "the sources of taxation in India are few and cannot be increased." In other words, in taxing the people to provide the defence required, we leave the people, when famine comes, only a gasping existence. Sir H. Fowler speaks of borrowing £6,000,000 on the market without being one whit the worse financially, because of the famine fund expenditure, a statement which, when compared with Lord G. Hamilton's admission that Indian taxation cannot be increased, requires revision of a drastic kind. All the loans, of course, must come from the produce of the country, reproductive works and all, and the ability to pay taxes is an index of prosperity. Here, however, one has the "authoritative statement" that the last penny is already levied. And one can believe it when one finds that the famine and the plague have already

cost the Government Treasury fully Rs. 12,000,000 without mentioning the Rs. 2,000,000 of advances, which are only believed to be recoverable, nor counting the inevitable general items and the extras still to be taken into account. The crowds of people earning usually 1½d. and 2d. a day are visited with plague and famine, an area of 322,900 square miles becomes a thirity waste, a population of 68,000,000 suffers, of which 4,224,000 have to be relieved so that the breath may be kept in them, and there is no wonder that the limit of the taxable capacity of such a people has been reached. Lord George suited the task of telling the miserable story and his attitude, however unattractive, deserves greater attention than the courageous pose of Sir H. Fowler.

The view here taken of the financial condition of India is demonstrable from Lord George Hamilton's "authoritative statement." What of the prospect, therefore? Deficits are now steadily recurring. Rs. 2,464,000 on the three years ending 1897-8 is brought out without any disclosure of the state of the debt. But even this poor display is dependent upon the estimate for 1897-8 which itself shows a deficit of Rs. 2,464,000, Lord George persisting throughout in regarding such estimates as though they were closed accounts, whereas the strongest probability exists that they are inadequate for the situation. The Secretary of State says that "the famine has entirely upset the Budget calculations" for 1896-7 a fact of the most obvious kind. But are there not signs which point to the upsetting of the 1897-8 Budget? And, however satisfactory the late rains, the signs surely are not such as to point to the disappearance of the estimated deficit, but rather to a deficit larger than the estimate. Yet, in face of this, what steps are proposed to meet the situation? When a people are taxed to the limit of endurance, on the admission of an "authoritative statement," some review of the position with the object of curbing outgoings might be expected. The Budget speech may be examined in vain for any indication of an economical tendency in expenditure. Everything seemingly is to be maintained at present cost, and loans are to be resorted to which cannot be raised in India nor (though Sir H. Fowler demurs) be so cheerfully subscribed in London as he supposed. Indeed, is all to be maintained as before? Referring to the army, Lord George Hamilton made some extraordinary remarks respecting the proportion of men to population in India compared with our Continental standard. Such a comparison must have had some meaning, and can, indeed, only mean that he would, if he could, increase the *personnel* of the Indian army. That hint makes it necessary to remind ourselves that in 1884-85 the net expenditure on the army was Rs. 16,251,000, and the estimate for 1897-8 is Rs. 24,514,000, an increase of 60 per cent. in fourteen years. Remembering the financial position, the economic condition of large sections of the community, we submit there is grave reason for censure of the attitude of the Indian Government and the Secretary of State. Is it too much to say that the attitude is too exclusively military? Defence is spoken of as from military power only, and the people's discontent and suffering and poverty are overlooked, or, at any rate,

the defensive value of a thriving population is too much neglected. Nor can this be surprising if all the rulers of India share Lord George's sentiments. He refers incidentally to the fall in the opium revenue and quite unnecessarily reminds Parliament that he had no "objections from a moral point of view to the Indian Government deriving a certain portion of its revenue from opium." From that to the next paragraph on the army, with its ethical postulate of force as the only guarantee of security, is an easy transition. However wretched the condition of many millions of the people may be, the authorities have the support of Lord George Hamilton in a policy which will spend on swords to guard a people dying of famine and plague.

The administration is unquestionably entitled to credit for much heroic and much successful work done in combating the threefold calamity from which India is now suffering and nothing in these remarks should be deemed to overlook, still less intentionally minimise, such service. But, while cheerfully recognising that, one must repeat that the financial and economic condition of India to-day is a matter for grave disquietude, and seems moreover to be due directly to a policy the outline of which is that the Government directs its eyes to the Afghanistan and other borderlands, to the comparative neglect of the development of the interior, whence the sustenance of the people arises. In pursuit of this policy now for a long series of years the finances have been brought again to a critical state—a state in which taxation is at the maximum, Government being upheld in part by loans, with anything but a bright prospect of improvement.

AGRICULTURAL BANKS IN MYSORE.

FROM THE "TIMES."

The praise lately awarded to the Mysore Administration in Parliament was well deserved. Since its rendition to its native dynasty in 1881 this principality, with its population of 4½ millions, has won a leading place for good government among the Feudatory States. During exactly half a century it had been under British rule, and from 1861 it was practically in the hands of British district officers, British divisional commissioners, and a British Chief Commissioner at their head. If it were possible so to ingrain the British system into Indian administration that it should endure after British supervision was withdrawn, the experiment had been made in Mysore. The result proves that it is possible to do so. Under an accomplished prince, whose death has been one of India's great losses during the closing decade of the century, Mysore more than realised all that was hoped for. The Maharaja was assisted by a Prime Minister of rare ability and possessed of that faculty for securing continuous effect to his views, which is one of the highest attributes of statesmanship. Sir Sheshadri Iyer has shown that progress in the native State need not be interrupted by the death of its ruler, however valuable the personal qualities of the ruler may have been. Under the regency Mysore not only maintains its reputation for enlightened government, but it is bringing to maturity the good seed which its late Prince sowed. Alone among the Indian principalities, Mysore has been able to establish an institution which, in some respects and under proper safeguards, contains the germs of a representative assembly. The annual address delivered by the Prime Minister to that assembly is recognised to be an important utterance of the Indian year. As we pointed out last December, Sir Sheshadri Iyer's account of his stewardship is one of increasing revenue, reduced taxation,

and a large expansion of cultivation and of industrial enterprises. The result is due in part to the fact that Mysore rests secure from attack under the aegis of the British power. It is also due in part to gold discoveries within the State, and to the rapid extension of mining and coffee planting conducted by British capital. But after all such considerations have been allowed for, the prosperity of Mysore is largely owing to the firm, wise, and long-continued direction of its affairs by a Prime Minister who enjoys the confidence alike of the British Government and of the Queen Regent and the people.

In no part of India is there a stronger feeling of attachment to the British Crown. For in no part of India has modern education been carried so far, with so little relaxation of the traditional reverence of the Hindus to a personal Sovereign. The account of the magnificent Jubilee celebrations in Mysore, brought by recent mails, comes with almost a sense of relief after the disturbing events by which that national festival was marred in other parts of India.

The prospects of the present season, which have been brightened by more favourable conditions in the British provinces, still cause grave anxiety in Mysore. The south-west monsoon had, up to the end of July, brought but a scanty rainfall. Unless a more copious supply has been received during the past three weeks, Mysore may have again to fight with scarcity, perhaps deepening into famine. It has shown more than once, and conspicuously in 1892, that it is prepared for the battle. But in Mysore, as elsewhere, the old theory that several bad seasons are required to make a famine no longer holds strictly true. There, as everywhere throughout India, the people are less patient of suffering than in bygone generations; for they have been trained to expect that the Government shall come to their relief with a promptitude and on a scale never before dreamed of. The staying-power of the people is, perhaps, not diminished so far as regards their material condition, but it has decreased in respect to their willingness to suffer. How to redress the balance by augmenting their material resources in proportion as their powers of endurance lessen is the initial problem of famine in Mysore, as in British India.

That problem Sir Sheahdri Iyer is endeavouring to solve by a plan of his own. There can be no doubt that agricultural banks would go far to bring out the whole resources of the cultivators, and to raise a breakwater between scarcity and the need of Government relief. The method adopted in British India is for the Government itself to advance money to the husbandmen and peasant proprietors for digging wells and other useful works. Under this system of *takkavi* advances the Government is itself the creditor, and realises its loans by a process similar to that used for the recovery of the land revenue. The system is an old one, but the objection to it is of equally long standing—namely, that the Government cannot turn petty banker on a scale sufficient to meet the requirements of 200 millions of peasants. Nor have the proposals for agricultural banks put forward in British India been able to overcome a fundamental difficulty. Without special facilities given by Government to such banks for recovering their loans, the capital is not forthcoming. But the very act of granting such special facilities tends to saddle the Government with the odium of enforcing private debts to the banks by the stringent machinery reserved for the public revenue, and to place other creditors of the peasants *pro tanto* at a disadvantage. The Mysore scheme endeavours to obviate these objections by the Raiffeisen system, under which the local community itself supplies the capital and enforces payment.

The scheme was set forth in great detail in the Mysore Government Gazette at the end of 1895. Within six months 30 rural banks of the kind had been formed, or were in course of formation in the State. The regulations provide that every such bank is to be an association of landholders or peasant tenureholders on co-operative principles, not for the purpose of earning a profit divisible among its members, but for the purpose of obtaining money by their united credit, and of lending it among themselves according to the actual requirements of each member and to the extent to which the other members have confidence in him. The funds of the bank are to be raised by receiving deposits from the members, or by loans from outsiders. The security for these loans or deposits is the joint security of the association, which forms the bank. The security to the bank for the repayment of a loan to one of its members is the joint security of the borrower and of two

sureties who should also be members. No loan may be made to any one who is not a member. The scheme gives to the depositor the security of an association of responsible tenureholders instead of the security of the individual borrower. Its local knowledge enables it to admit as members only men of approved honesty and thrift. The bank thus secures a carefully-selected class of borrowers, and it lends only for agricultural operations which will repay the outlay. Such operations include the redemption of land from mortgage, the purchase of stock, the extension of individual holdings on the security of the entire tenure, and, generally, small agricultural improvements likely to yield a good return. Every borrower is bound to expend what he borrows on the express object for which the loan is made. Any failure to do this is punished by the recall of the loan at three months' notice. Loans for the ordinary annual requirements of cultivation must be repaid within the year. Loans for more permanent works are repaid by annual instalments, and the amount of any such loan is not to exceed the ascertained margin of profits from which the annual instalments shall be repaid. The interest charged by the bank is to be sufficient only for the payment of the interest on its deposits, with a small margin for the actual expenses of management and the gradual formation of a reserve fund. The reserve fund is not to be divided among the members, but is to be kept as an additional security for depositors, or as a loan fund to be used under the same safeguards as are applied to the lending of deposits.

Mysore has thus been able to establish a number of small rural banks, without share capital, paying no dividends, and each operating in a limited area with a perfect knowledge of the character, requirements, and solvency of its customers. A rural community in which such a bank is established obtains the advances required for remunerative agricultural works on the joint security of the men of ascertained substance within it. But it is only the thrifty and solvent members of the community who can hope to become borrowers. Nor can even the thrifty and the solvent get loans except for definite works to be carried out under the eye of the lenders. Loans for wedding ceremonies and other extravagant festivals—at once the profit and the ruin of the village money-lender in India—cannot be obtained from these banks. Exceptional cases of *bona fide* domestic requirements are provided for, but they are strictly scrutinised, and the security for the repayment must be ample. The scheme supplies an automatic check on the misapplication of the funds. The members of the bank, who are responsible for the repayment of the deposits, are always on the spot, and the use to which one of their neighbours actually puts a loan admits of no concealment. A general committee of the members watches for any diversion of loans from the objects for which they were borrowed. A smaller executive committee, not exceeding five, conducts the actual business of lending, and meets regularly to examine into the expediency of granting each separate loan. The members of these committees receive no remuneration for their services other than the esteem that attends the discharge of a useful public duty and the respect which Indian villagers accord to neighbours from whom money can be borrowed at low interest. A million rupees found their way to the cultivators under this system in the Mysore State within a few months, and so complete were the local knowledge and supervision that scarcely a bad debt resulted. It is too early, however, to judge of the scheme if carried out on a scale commensurate with the requirements of the whole rural population. At present it still remains an experiment in co-operative self-help, but an experiment which is being watched with interest by our officers in the British provinces and to which all must wish success.

We are just now passing through a small Indian crisis, in which the Indian Secretary blames the vernacular Press for its seditious language about plague regulations in Poona. What are the facts? These journals have been pointing out cases in which undue violence has been offered to religious and domestic prejudices; they have been supporting the attempts to restrict the plague, if put into force with care and discrimination; and they have been warning the Government that trouble would happen if severe measures were thoughtlessly carried out. Trouble has arisen, and it is all, or most of it, put down to the Vernacular Press.—*Eastern Daily Press*.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1897.

THE FRUITS OF THE "FORWARD" POLICY.

The criminal folly of the "forward" frontier policy at last stands revealed to every man, woman or child who is able to read. Warnings and expostulations without number have been thrown away upon the military clique who control the Government of India, and every edition of every British newspaper now shows the penalty which is being paid for headlong obstinacy. The latest news as we go to press tells us that the Afridis are "up"—the Afridis from whom Lord Roberts assured an interviewer on August 20 that no serious difficulty was to be anticipated—Fort Maude has been captured, and the inhospitable regions lying beyond the North-West frontier of British India are ablaze. The series of disasters which the Government of India has recklessly brought not so much upon itself as upon the luckless taxpayers, its subjects—*quidquid delirant reges, plebsntur Achivi*—began on June 10 with the attack in the Tochi Valley. Next came the "rising" in the Swat Valley, which was reported on July 27; then the Shikbadar incident, reported on August 8; and finally the sequence of events in the parts about Peshawar which began on August 15 and will end nobody knows when. In the long run, no doubt, a precarious peace will be secured by the brave and well-equipped army which is at the disposal of Anglo-Indian militarism, but one shudders to think

of the cost in blood and treasure at which the consequences of a fatuous policy will be, not redeemed, but momentarily hidden once more from public observation. A certain melancholy interest attaches to the efforts which are now being made to foist upon the public any explanation but the obviously right one for the series of outbreaks. One party, represented at its best, which is also its worst, by an old-fashioned Tory like Mr. Frederick Greenwood, finds the desired cause in Lord Salisbury's weakness and vacillation in dealing with the Great Assassin. Another party, represented by Lord Roberts and the Simla clique, assures us that all the trouble is due to "fanaticism." Both parties insinuate that the Amir of Afghanistan, in spite of his assurances to the contrary and his friend, is largely responsible. In fact, anything and anybody are to blame except the "forward" policy and its supporters. The manifest truth is, of course, that the so-called border tribes—the tribes, that is, beyond our border—desire simply to be let alone. They find their independence, which they value more than their lives, threatened by the unceasing aggression of the Government of India. Their alarm is well founded. On March 14, 1895, when the Government of India was about to despatch an expedition for the relief of Dr. Robertson and his force in Chitral, the Governor-General in Council issued the following proclamation to the tribes beyond the Peshawar frontier:—

"The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present, and prevent any future aggression in Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained the force will be withdrawn. The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes; and they will scrupulously avoid any acts of hostility towards the tribesmen so long as they on their part refrain from attacking or impeding in any way the march of the troops."

That was the bargain, and the Government of India, aided and abetted by Lord George Hamilton and his colleagues in the present Cabinet, broke it. No sooner had the object of the relief expedition been attained than the Government of India cynically suggested steps involving flat disregard of the proclamation. The suggestion was declined (and, as Lord Rosebery announced, declined unanimously) by the late Liberal Government. But unfortunately before the Government of India had acted upon the order, a defeat of the Home Government placed Lord Salisbury in power. One of the first acts of the new ministry was to reverse their predecessors' order in regard to Chitral—in other words, to direct a flagrant breach of faith. Mr. Balfour, it will be remembered, took the opportunity of observing that where a British soldier had set his foot, there he must remain. That doctrine, of course, was precisely what the tribes beyond the border had feared, and their present conduct is not only such as was to be expected, but such as was actually predicted at the time by competent judges.

There is no need to review here the "forward" frontier policy as a whole. Readers of INDIA are aware that no subject has been more consistently prominent in this journal since its first publication in 1890. Moreover, as it happens most fortunately

that there is in this matter a clear difference between the Liberal and the Tory Front Benches, Liberal newspapers in the United Kingdom are for once strongly on the side of reason and justice in India. There are, however, one or two points to which we may well direct attention. In the first place, one cannot help contrasting with the actual course of events the optimistic statements made by Lord George Hamilton in his reply to Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the address on February 17, 1896. In defiance of Lord Elgin's proclamation Chitral had then been occupied, a road had been constructed between Chitral and Peshawar, and fortified posts had been planted in the territory of tribesmen whose independence had been guaranteed. Here is Lord George Hamilton's account of what had taken place, and of what might be expected:

"The most sanguine anticipations that anyone could have indulged in had been more than realised. (Hear, hear.) So far from their occupation being regarded in a hostile spirit by the people of the country, on the contrary, they welcomed the English occupation, because it had inaugurated a period of security which they had not known before. (Hear, hear.)

... The Government had succeeded in making an excellent road from Peshawar to Chitral, and the tribes through whose territory it had passed had of their own accord undertaken to protect it. The result was that commerce had largely increased. The number of animals and caravans passing through that country had immensely increased, and, moreover, the country was by no means so poor as was supposed. On the contrary, it was evident that many hundreds of years ago it was much more thickly populated than it was now, and there were many signs of returning prosperity. It was, therefore, in the interest both of the intervening tribes as well as of the Chitralis that the policy this House maintained last year should in no sense be disturbed. (Hear, hear.) ... There had been a difference between the Indian Government and the tribes as regarded the Proclamation, but only in one sense. The heads of the tribes petitioned the Political Officer asking to be incorporated in British territory. (Laughter and cheers.) They said they had felt such advantage and sense of security from the presence of the troops, and no doubt from the better prices they got for their produce, that they thought they would like to have these benefits permanently. They were told it was impossible they could be so incorporated."

And at the close of a speech which was loudly applauded by the Tory wisacres below the gang-way Lord George Hamilton added:—

"Before sitting down he congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned, and which would tend to put an end to those periodical disturbances and outbreaks of fanaticism and terrorism which had characterised that portion of her Majesty's dominions. (Cheers.)"

Well, we see now what Lord George Hamilton's almost lyrical outburst was worth. We have before our eyes the spectacle of that "period of security" which they had not known before. We are able to appreciate at its right value the termination of "these periodical disturbances and outbreaks of fanaticism and terrorism which had characterised that portion of her Majesty's dominions." Lord G. Hamilton was highly indignant at the suggestion that there had been a breach of faith. As to that, if any test be needed, there is a simple one. What would have happened if the proclamation, instead of stating what it did, had stated, in Mr. Balfour's

words, that where a British soldier sets his foot, there he must remain? Would the tribesmen then have refrained "from attacking or impeding in any way" the march of the expedition? There are some questions which answer themselves. There is a remarkable contrast not only between the course of events and Lord G. Hamilton's speech of February, 1897, but also between that speech and his Budget speech of August 5 last. On the latter occasion he said, in self-defence, that "no one expected, when we extended our sphere of influence over these territories, that they would at once abandon their predatory and pugnacious habits." Why, that was precisely the expectation which Lord George Hamilton himself held out eighteen months ago. He now says:—

"There is only one method by which the tribes along our Indian frontier can be permanently weaned from their old malpractices, and that is to so improve their material condition that they will not risk the advantages they have thus gained for the mere fun of fighting."

"The mere fun of fighting" is apparently a synonym for "fanaticism." But to most of us this fun or fanaticism seems rather to resemble what we call patriotism. Why should we resent in the tribes beyond our North-West frontier qualities which Englishmen admire in each other? And what paradoxical stupidity it is to suppose that we can make the tribesmen love us by building a road through their country, fortifying posts in it, and, in Lord G. Hamilton's latest phrase, "extending our sphere of influence over them," when the proclamation of March, 1895, expressly declared that we had no intention of "interfering with their independence"!

The strangest feature of the whole disastrous business is that it is so totally unnecessary. The "forward" frontier policy, as every expert with the (present) exception of Lord Roberts declares, is not merely useless, but worse than useless. Its ostensible *raison d'être* is the possibility of Russian invasion of India by way of the North-West frontier. How absurd the notion of such an invasion is, we need not pause to show. But if we assume for the sake of the argument, and for the sake of the argument alone, that such an invasion is a likely contingency, how does the "forward" frontier policy help the defence of India? It begins by throwing away the enormous advantages of India's natural frontier. It reduces, if for ourselves then also for the invader, the difficulties of the rocky and mountainous region between Chitral and Peshawar by the construction of a military road. It kills off the bravest of the indigenous tribesmen, who fight us for their cherished independence—how many men, one wonders, who under a wiser policy would have been stout defenders of our frontier will be killed off before the present imbroglio is ended? It alienates the goodwill of the tribesmen who survive. And meantime it spreads discontent throughout India by imposing enormous burdens upon her impoverished taxpayers. Lord George Hamilton said on August 5 that the Toshi expedition was estimated to cost Rs. 330,000, and that the cost of the Malakand expeditionary force would be Rs. 400,000. Some time hence it will be our duty to compare these precious estimates with the actual cost. All we know

at present is that money is being poured out like water, and will continue to be until a doubtful peace is once more patched up. Who is to pay the bill? If precedent be followed, the bill will be paid by the Indian taxpayers. But that would be a monstrous injustice. The "forward" policy, whatever else may be said or thought of it, is essentially an Imperial policy, and should be paid for from the Imperial exchequer. Once let that point be secured, and the "forward" policy is doomed. But how, and by whom, is it to be secured? And who can say that the fighting of the past six weeks is not the forerunner of a third invasion of Afghanistan? The *Times*, and especially the Simla correspondent of the *Times*, seems to be heading in that direction, and the Amir himself can hardly fail to perceive that, while our operations beyond the North-West frontier are of no conceivable value for the defence of the frontier, they might very well prove of service as the forerunners of another invasion of his dominions. That would be a calamity of the first magnitude.

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE CONGRESS.

"So far from being in any way objectionable, the Congress affords an open, honest and loyal means of making the views and wishes of the most intelligent section of the Indian people known to the Government. We want no secret societies . . . either here or in India; and I firmly believe that, if the Congress or any similar institution had existed in India in the year 1857, we should never have experienced the horrors of the Indian Mutiny."—The Right Hon. Sir Richard Garth, Q.C., in the *Lancet Magazine and Review*, February, 1895.

It might have been expected that among the reflections excited in the Anglo-Indian press by the cowardly assassinations at Poona one would find at least some friendly words of encouragement to an organisation so loyal and constitutional as the Indian National Congress. The murder of Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand has been denounced and deplored by every section of the Indian community. But in no section has it aroused more profound indignation and dismay than among the supporters of the Congress movement. To them it appears in the light not only of a foul and detestable crime, but also of a humiliating calamity, suggesting that many years of patient work have after all failed in their primary purpose—the purpose, namely, of directing into strictly constitutional channels any sense of public injustice and demand for redress of grievances. "We want no secret societies," wrote Sir Richard Garth—a strong Tory, a Privy Councillor, a former Chief Justice of Bengal—in his defence of the Congress against the vituperation of Sir George Chesney. To resist "underground" methods, to make sedition impossible—that is and has been the chosen work of the Congress in its zeal for the stability of British rule in India. It was to be expected, therefore, we repeat, that in the critical period through which India is now passing the public exponents of Anglo-Indian opinion would hold out a kindly hand to such an organisation. But they have done nothing of the kind. On the contrary, they have in so many words laid the Poona assassinations to the charge of the Congress, and have denounced the Congress and

all its works in language which one can only describe as ferocious.

The paradox is sufficiently amazing. But it would have been still more amazing if its authors had not, ever since the foundation of the Congress, assailed it with vehement abuse. Sir Richard Garth, in the article from which we quote above, carefully examined the composition and the work of the Congress, and it may be interesting at this moment to recall the substance of what he said. The value of his testimony, we may remark in passing, is as high as could well be. His Toryism is beyond reproach. His capacity to weigh evidence is that which one expects to find in a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. And he went out to India in 1876, "believing, as most Englishmen do, that our government there was a model of paternal rule." Sir George Chesney described the supporters of the Congress as a set of inept blundering political charlatans whose proceedings, when they were not merely silly, were undoubtedly mischievous. Sir Richard Garth's description is rather different:—

"The Indian National Congress," he wrote, "is a large, influential and important assembly of earnest and patriotic gentlemen who, since 1885, have at the close of each year met at one or other of the large centres in India, such as Calcutta, Madras or Bombay, to discuss their political views and opinions."

The delegates of the Congress, duly elected from every part of India, were, Sir Richard found, thoroughly representative in point of rank, profession and religion. So far as Bengal was concerned, he wrote: "I am personally acquainted with several of these gentlemen. They have often been guests at my own house. I have met them constantly in the best native society in Calcutta, at Government House levées, and at Government House parties." And what had they done to deserve the invective of Sir George Chesney and his friends? Here is Sir Richard Garth's answer:—

"I will tell you what they have done. They have dared to think for themselves; and not only for themselves, but for the millions of poor ignorant people who compose our Indian Empire. They have been content to sacrifice their own interests, and to brave the displeasure of Government, in order to lend a helping hand to those poor people. They have had the courage and the patriotism to denounce abuses which have disgraced our Indian rule for years past; which have been condemned by public opinion in India and in England, and to which the Indian Government appear to cling with a tenacity which seems utterly inexplicable. They have dared to propose reforms which, despite the resistance of the Government, have been approved by Parliament, and to endeavour to stave that fearful amount of extravagance which has been going on in India for years past, and has been the means, as some of our best and wisest counsellors consider, of bringing our Eastern Empire to the verge of bankruptcy. That is what these good men have done to deserve the taunts and insults of the member for Oxford city, and the relentless persecution of the Government of India."

Sir Richard Garth, it may be added, did not agree with all of the resolutions adopted by the Congress. But he was in no doubt whatever as to two points. The first was the perfect loyalty of the Congress:—

"I defy any man to find fault with the perfect loyalty and respect to her Majesty and the Ruling Power, with which its proceedings are conducted. I have studied them from time to time very carefully; I have never seen a single instance of any disloyal sentiment or expression."

The second point was the treatment meted out to the Congress by the Government of India :—

"Of all the many acts of injustice which have marked the conduct of the Government of India of late years, there is none in my opinion which can at all compare with their insolent treatment of the Indian National Congress. There is no subject, I consider, upon which the English press and the English public have been so cruelly and persistently misled by the Government party."

We make no apology for quoting at such length from Sir Richard Garth's trenchant article. His judgment, we submit, carries more weight than the maledictions of anonymous detractors in the *Times* and elsewhere. The Congress of course is not in any sense upon its trial. It has long since passed that stage. All that the Anglo-Indian journalists who are now giving such marvellously bad advice to the Government of India succeed in showing is that, in their opinion, criticism is of necessity sedition. Their cynical theory appears to be that, under circumstances of admitted difficulty, the best friends of the Government of India are those who invariably and lustily urge it along the path it pleases to take, while its worst enemies are those who point out the pitfalls they perceive and, in a spirit of friendly helpfulness, offer suggestions and, if need be, warnings. It is as if a wayfarer travelling along a dark road in a strange country should revile and furiously assault any of the inhabitants who dared to put him on his guard against difficulties and dangers that threatened him. The young gentlemen who produce the *Pioneer*, and journals of the same type, seem to suggest that an Indian who dares to make a suggestion, or to resent a grievance, deserves imprisonment. It is a strange view. But perhaps it is the business of quasi-official journalists under a military despotism to hold that view and to defend it. One thing, however, is certain. It is not a view which is likely to be entertained by rational Englishmen at home. For it necessarily involves one of two assumptions—either that the Government is perfect or that discontent must be systematically driven inwards. The Indian National Congress is not likely in the long run to suffer in consequence of official, or quasi-official, persecution. But such persecution is nevertheless a pity—for its authors. As for the abuse which has lately been poured in certain quarters upon this journal as the organ of the Congress, we need only say that some accusations are too grotesque to merit reply. We have nothing to retract, and do not estimate the amiable threat of "suppression" at the value of a brass farthing. INDIA has come to stay; and the ampler scope offered by weekly publication will, we trust, in the near future tend somewhat to diminish our shortcomings in the not too easy task of seeking to bring more closely together the peoples of India and the United Kingdom.

We fancy the nail has been hit on the head by one gentleman who poses as an authority on Indian matters. It is the opinion of an old man, who well remembers the Mutiny and the causes that led up to it. The chief cause in his view is the total lack of sympathy between the native and European races. All other reasons, or so-called reasons, are merely details. This is the great cause underlying all others.—*Financial Guide*.

THE CASE FOR ENQUIRY AT POONA.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN AND HIS CONSTITUENTS.

THE following letter from Sir W. Wedderburn M.P., to the editor of the *Banffshire Journal* appeared in that newspaper on August 17 :—

SIR,—I have no reason to complain of the terms in which you refer, in your issue of the 3rd instant, to my personal explanation in the House of Commons—on the contrary I take this opportunity to express my thanks—but as there may exist among my constituents some misapprehension regarding the circumstances under which I expressed my regret on that occasion, will you allow me, in your columns, briefly to state the facts so far as I am personally concerned.

I do not think the people of this country fully realise the misery suffered during this year by the unhappy people of India, and how their minds are distracted by their accumulated misfortunes. Men, women and children are still dying in thousands from hunger. And in Poona the famine was added the bubonic plague in a horrible form; and to the plague were added stringent measures of house visitation and segregation, parties of military being employed to enter and search dwelling-houses, to examine the inmates, and to remove those believed to be infected to a plague camp at a distance from their homes. Such measures, however necessary and beneficial under the circumstances, would in any community be likely to arouse excitement and irritation, especially among the ignorant. But in India where domestic privacy and caste observance are valued almost more than life, very strong feeling must unavoidably be aroused under such circumstances. The people in Poona unhappily became excited, and even panic-stricken; wild rumours spread abroad; and the disasters of the situation culminated on June 23, in the lamentable assassination, by some unknown hand, of Mr. Rand, the Chairman of the Poona Plague Committee.

The situation was a serious one, demanding full and careful enquiry into the facts, with calm judgment and kindly consideration for the suffering condition of the people. But what did the authorities do in India and at home? As the assassin of Mr. Rand could not be discovered, the Bombay Government quartered upon the city of Poona a large force of punitive police, to be paid for by the inhabitants already ruined by the famine, thus punishing the innocent and suffering many for the guilt of a few; while Lord George Hamilton, in the House of Commons, spoke ominously of the need for restricting the liberty of the native Press. Now such measures of oppression appeared to me under the circumstances to be neither just nor safe. Lord George Hamilton assumed that the Press created the discontent at Poona. But it is more in accordance with experience to suppose that the Press had (usefully) given voice to a popular feeling already existing. And there were also special reasons for discontent connected with the plague administration at Poona as distinguished from

Bombay, where the operations were successfully carried through by General Gatacre. In Bombay the search parties were accompanied by committees of native gentlemen, who explained matters to the people, and the guards employed were native Sepoys, who understood and sympathised with the popular prejudices, and could enter the houses of their fellow caste men without offending religious feeling. Accordingly in Bombay the people were practically reconciled to the measures adopted, and all passed off quietly. But unfortunately in Poona two serious mistakes were made: First, European soldiers were employed upon the delicate duty of house visitation; and second, the complaints made in connexion with this work were not properly enquired into. The European soldiers employed are deserving of all honour for carrying through this dangerous and distasteful work of searching and dealing with plague-stricken houses; but no one supposes that they could realise the acute mental pain of Hindus and Muhammadans if a stranger and foreigner enters the rooms reserved for the preparation of food, the performance of religious ceremonial, and the seclusion of women. Misunderstandings and grievances must necessarily arise under such trying circumstances; and unfortunately complaints thus arising were not properly enquired into. Numerous petitions were presented to Mr. Rand from time to time, and on May 20 a formal memorial was addressed to the Bombay Government, purporting to bear the signatures of some 2,000 inhabitants of Poona, Hindu and Muhammadan, couched in moderate terms, and complaining of ill-treatment and oppression. To the memorial was added an appendix, containing specific charges, signed by the parties aggrieved. This memorial was presented to the Government by the Presidents of the leading Hindu and Muhammadan Associations of the Deccan. And I maintain that a memorial of such a character should have been dealt with at once. Full and impartial enquiry should have been made. If the complaints were substantiated redress should have been afforded; if they proved to be false, those making the charges should have been punished. In no other way can the good name of the British administration be maintained. Unfortunately no such enquiry had been made nor had any answer been sent to the memorialists up to the month of July when I questioned Lord George Hamilton on the subject in the House of Commons.

From the above narrative it will be seen that the question at issue between the Indian authorities and myself was, whether severe measures of repression should be employed, through the police, and by restrictions on the press; or whether grounds had been shown for a thorough and impartial enquiry into the whole Poona plague administration, in order to ascertain the causes which had led to such deplorable results. As I could not obtain any assurance from Lord George Hamilton that such an enquiry would be instituted I decided to bring the matter before the Indian Parliamentary Committee, an informal body of about 120 members, not pledged to any special measures, but interested in India, and desirous of promoting a just and sympathetic policy towards her. At that time there were in London

four representative Indian gentlemen of high character, who had been deputed from Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Poona to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure, presided over by Lord Welby; and I invited these four gentlemen to the Conference Room of the House of Commons, in order that they might at first hand place before the Indian Parliamentary Committee their case from the Indian point of view. Professor Gokhale, who represented Poona, had left that place in March, but he had been kept informed by correspondence of what was going on, and he described to the Committee the miserable and distracted condition of the people, under the combined calamities of famine, plague, house searching, and punitive police. He stated that the wildest rumours were abroad, and that two of his correspondents, in whom he had confidence, had informed him of a current report in Poona that two native women had been outraged by European soldiers, and that one of them had committed suicide. I most sincerely regret that this statement was ever made; but I am bound to express my belief that Mr. Gokhale, who was much moved by the sufferings of his friends in Poona, mentioned the existence of the rumour, not with evil intent, but in order to show the extreme necessity for that full enquiry, to obtain which was the sole object of the meeting. When it appeared by telegram from Bombay that no proof was forthcoming in support of the charge, I at once expressed in the most public way open to me, my deep regret that I had directly or indirectly been instrumental in giving currency to a charge which proves to have been unfounded.

Many hard things have been said of me in this connexion, and I leave it to the public, on a consideration of the facts above set forth, to decide whether they have all been deserved. I may perhaps point out that this is no party question. Secretaries of State for India, whether in or out of office, give voice only to the official view of Indian affairs, and the case for India is rarely heard in this country. I think therefore that I may not unreasonably claim some sympathy and support from independent public opinion in my endeavours, however weak and defective, to make known the Indian view of the case, and thus to help the people of this country to hear both sides, and to fulfil their responsibilities with regard to India. The people of India have so little voice in the management of their own affairs, that it is all the more necessary to listen patiently and kindly to their complaints, especially when, as now, they are almost at the point of despair from the accumulated misfortunes that have fallen upon them.—I have, etc.,

W. WOODS.

* Banff, 16th August, 1897.

If any faith can be placed—and we think a good deal may—in the statements of the citizens who memorialised Lord Sandhurst, the inhabitants of Poona have been subjected to a reign of terror, due to the irregular and oppressive high-handedness of the special agency employed by the Plague Committee. The memorialists had but little fault to find with the rules made by the Committee under the orders of the Government, but they alleged that the regulations were often violated, and that redress was sought in vain.—*South-Eastern Gazette.*

"THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST."

We select the following from the newspaper comments upon Sir W. Wedderburn's articles on the Indian famine which, as we stated in our last issue, were reprinted in pamphlet form, under the title, "The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast," and circulated to members of Parliament, in view of the debate on the Indian Budget.

In a review printed on July 28 the *Daily Chronicle* wrote:—

This pamphlet is a reprint of a series of articles that appeared in *INDIA*, February to June of this year, dealing with the condition of the Indian rayat, or cultivator of the soil. An introduction has been added, and, by permission of the proprietors of the *Graphic*, there is a picture by way of frontispiece showing the condition to which some of these unfortunate Indian peasants have been reduced by their present circumstances. But it must not be supposed that this pamphlet is a mere catalogue of famine horrors—indeed, it only deals incidentally with that calamity—it is a sober and suggestive examination of the general conditions under which, whether there be famine or whether there be plenty, the Indian cultivator lives his life of monotonous toil. Sir William Wedderburn speaks with knowledge of his subject, for he spent many years of his life as an Indian civilian among the people of the Deccan. His main contention is that with certain reasonable reforms in the administration the rayat might become moderately prosperous, instead of as at present continuously impoverished, so that at the approach of famine he might be possessed of such a store of food, money, or credit, as would enable him to tide over the evil days. There are several important points to which he draws attention, of which we will notice two:—

(1) The need for the establishment of agricultural banks to enable the rayat to obtain his working capital at reasonable rates of interest.

"In Germany alone there are some 2,000 such banks, doing a business amounting to something like 180 millions sterling, with immense benefit to the rural population. Every other country in Europe has followed the example of Germany; the Statesmen of all the Russias started such banks with liberal support; and even the unshakeable Turk has made some movements in the same direction. In India alone nothing has been done. The Autocrat of the India Office would neither give himself, nor allow others to move."

A scheme for an agricultural bank took shape at Poona. It met with the cordial support of the local authorities and the Imperial Government in India; a unanimous despatch signed by the Viceroy and his colleagues was sent to the Secretary of State asking for his sanction for the scheme; public opinion in England was favourable; the Press, including the *Times*, gave their approval; Lancashire smiled on the scheme; and in the City of London the financial house of Rothschild regarded the proposal with interest and favour; but the India Office stood in the way.

"The scheme represented the care and labour of many minds for many years; it had in it promise of relief to suffering millions; and it had no open enemies. But as it entered the portals of the India Office it was stabbed in the back, and I say that the act was a crime against the people of India."

(2) The harsh and rigid collection of the land revenue, which, contrary to immemorial custom in India, takes no account of good and bad seasons.

"This method of fixing an average demand, to be levied in cash, irrespective of the crop, may suit the case of capitalist farmers. But it has fairly broken the back of the rayat, who is a mere peasant living from hand to mouth. . . . He says, 'In former days there were Rājās that were good, and others that were bad; the good ones took a small share of our crop, and the bad a large share; but Heaven never before sent us a Rājā (Government) which takes from us, when we have no crop at all.' . . . I remember well, in the early days of my service, a benevolent collector trying to persuade a venerable village Patel of the advantages of a fixed average payment. But the old man replied by a

parable. He said, 'Oh, Sahob, I will relate to you a story. A traveller coming to a river found a man sitting there, and asked him how deep the river was. The man replied, "Four feet deep," so the traveller proceeded to cross the river. It was true that the river was four feet deep in the *scamrye*, but there was a deep hole in the middle, and into that hole the traveller fell and was drowned. Now if all we rayats go to the bottom in a bad year, what good will a moderate assessment do to us after that?'"

The fact is that the punctual demand for a fixed cash rent has altogether changed the relative position of debtor and creditor—i.e., of the rayat and the village *sahab*, or money-lender; while the substitution of our impartial but unfeeling debt courts for the old village *Panchayats* or courts of arbitration, where justice was tempered with the rough equity of public opinion has turned the creditor into "a grasping hard-hearted oppressor"—[look at the Gordons and Kirkwoods of England who flourish under our laws]—and the debtor into "a crouching false-hearted slave." In the first place, as all the rayats want cash on the same day to pay the tax, the money market gets very tight, and the local usurer can dictate any terms. In the second place, payment is demanded while the crop is unripe, so that in default of payment the crop may be available for seizure. Of course just before gathering his crop the rayat is like the rest of us just before pay-day—pretty well destitute of cash. In the third place, the revenue authorities, by their readiness to sell up defaulters lock, stock, and barrel, deliver the unfortunate peasants bound hand and foot to the tender mercies of the village *Shylock*. These statements are not the mere vapourings of a Congress-wallah. They are the sober conclusions of a Commission held in India to enquire into severe agricultural disturbances in the Deccan.

"Their conclusions were, in substance—first, that the rayat was driven to the money-lender by the harsh and rigid enforcement of the Government revenue demand; and secondly, that once in the toils of the money-lender the rayat was hopeless owing to the irresistible weapons furnished to the creditor by our Debt Courts. The Commissioners at the same time exploded certain time-honoured fallacies, such as the theory that the ruin of the rayat was caused by his extravagance in marriage and other ceremonies, the Commissioners reporting that for these purposes he did not spend more than was reasonable under the circumstances."

There is much more in this interesting pamphlet bearing directly on this momentous question—the condition of the Indian rayats who are from eighty to ninety per cent. of the whole population of India. We trust it will be circulated widely, for we are sure that the moderation and evident knowledge with which it is written cannot fail to strengthen the reasonable demand for a village enquiry into the condition of the Indian cultivator which Sir William Wedderburn makes, and which we believe would yield most valuable and much-needed information to the rulers of India.

The *Glossop Journal* wrote on July 31:—As usual the affairs of India will come before the House of Commons at the far end of the Session on the Indian Budget, when so great is the interest taken by our legislators in our vast Empire in the East that Indian affairs are generally discussed to a beggarly array of empty benches. The officials have, of course, to remain, and there will always be found a little band of men who have made a study of the question ready to plead the cause of the Indian native. But it is hard, up-hill work, and so other means have to be taken to inform the British public of the condition of their fellow-subjects in the East. It will be seen from a motion given elsewhere that when the Indian Budget is reached next week Sir William Wedderburn will ask for an exhaustive village to village enquiry with a view to discovering what are the evils which make famine and pestilence so rife in parts of India. The awful condition of hundreds of natives from starvation and plague was a dark spot in the general brightness of the Jubilee time, and now that India is a little more to the fore, it is sincerely hoped that the problems which urgently call for solution will be seriously considered, and happily, a beginning made towards the ending of some at least of the things that contribute so largely to the present depressing state of things.

No one has laboured with steadier persistency on behalf of the Indian rayat than Sir William Wedderburn. In and out of Parliament, by pen as well as voice, our neighbour of

Immediate is unnecessary in urging the claims of the people we have taken under our rule. There has been printed this week, and a copy has been sent to every member of Parliament so that none shall plead ignorance when Indian affairs come on, a pamphlet consisting of reprints of articles which have appeared in "INDIA" dealing with the condition of the Indian rayat, or cultivator of the soil. The famine and the plague, are of course, referred to in its pages. The pamphlet, however, is in no sense a catalogue of such horrors, but a serious and thoughtful examination of the present condition of things in India, with suggestions for remedies of evils which call aloud for removal. The flippant gentlemen who refuse to take the Indian advocates seriously, if they will take the trouble to read the pamphlet will not be able any longer to plead ignorance as an excuse for indifference towards Indian affairs. Sir William Wedderburn, it must be remembered speaks with authority. He knows the people for whom he pleads and their wants, and his conclusions are the result of opinions formed on the spot, he having lived as an official for many years amongst our Indian subjects.

Horrible as have been the reports from the famine and plague-stricken parts of India, we should not altogether despair, for hopes are held out that a recurrence of these awful afflictions may be mitigated, if not entirely prevented, by better methods than those which exist at present. In the articles from "INDIA" under review, Sir William Wedderburn sets out some of the more prominent evils which afflict the rayat, evils which he says have been admitted by the officials for the past thirty or forty years; and he claims to have proved that these evils are the direct result of ill-advised and revolutionary changes introduced by the British Government, and that when proper remedies are pointed out the administration will neither apply them itself nor let others do so. The evils are unnecessary. But there they are, and the result is a "state of economic collapse," whereas with a rich soil, a fine climate, a skilful, industrious, and frugal peasantry, India, "if she gets fair play, ought to be a garden, not a place of desolation." We cannot follow Sir William Wedderburn closely through his extremely able series of papers dealing with the history of how the Indian rayat has been brought to his present melancholy condition, but turn our attention more particularly to that part of the case which deals with the proposed remedies. The main contention is that with certain reasonable reforms in the administration the rayat might become moderately prosperous, instead of as at present continuously impoverished, so that at the approach of famine he might be possessed of such a store of food, money, or credit, as would enable him to tide over the evil days. The first necessity is the establishment of agricultural banks to enable the rayat to obtain his working capital at a reasonable rate of interest. This is not a novel suggestion, not new to readers of the Journal. Moreover, such agricultural banks are recognised institutions in other countries. We learn from the pamphlet that in Germany alone there are some 2,000 such banks, doing a business amounting to something like 150 millions sterling, with immense benefit to the rural population. Every other country in Europe has followed the example of Germany. In India alone nothing has been done.

Another contributory cause to the present distressing condition of the Indian rayat is the harsh and rigid collection of the land revenue, which takes no account of good or bad seasons. This method of fixing an average demand, to be levied in cash, irrespective of the crop, may, says Sir William, suit the case of capitalist farmers. But it has fairly broken the back of the rayat, who is a mere peasant living from hand to mouth. Sir William quotes the conclusions arrived at by a Commission held to enquire into severe agricultural disturbance in the Deccan in confirmation of his opinion:—

Their conclusions were, in substance—first, that the rayat was driven to the money-lender by the harsh and rigid enforcement of the Government revenue demand; and secondly, that once in the toils of the money-lender the rayat's case was hopeless owing to the irresistible weapons furnished to the creditor by our debt courts. The Commissioners at the same time exploded certain time-honoured fallacies, such as the theory that the ruin of the rayat was caused by his extravagance in marriage and other ceremonies, the Commissioners reporting that for these purposes he did not spend more than was reasonable under the circumstances.

When it is borne in mind that the rayats form from eighty to ninety per cent. of the whole population of India, it cannot

surely be said that the question of their condition is not worthy the serious attention of Parliament and of the country. Sir William Wedderburn's informing and moderate articles must do good. He has made out a very strong case for the amending village enquiry asked for in the motion he will submit on the Indian Budget. But it would be unwise to suppose that the House (which has quite a facility for doing the wrong thing—or not doing the right thing—in Indian affairs) will give Sir William his desire.

The *Newcastle Leader* wrote on August 2:—"Nobody expects to be told that our public men take little interest in the condition of our Eastern dependency. The few who endeavour to disseminate information are apt to be regarded as lunatics. Their persistence, however, is praiseworthy, and the special endeavours they make to direct attention to the grievances of the Hindus are not without influence upon English public opinion. As the annual debate on the Indian Budget draws near, pamphlets and circulars are distributed. This year the policy of the India Office will be challenged by Sir W. Wedderburn, who will move an amendment calling for an enquiry into the condition of the Indian villages. A similar demand was made last January, but it was not granted. When we remember that about 80 per cent. of the whole population of India lives in the rural districts, the condition of the villages is seen to be of the utmost importance. An investigation of the kind suggested could be wisely carried out, and the only obstacle to its being undertaken is the obstinacy of the India Office. It may, of course, be quite true that some of those who give great attention to Indian questions are inclined to exaggerate the evils of which they complain, and that native opinion may not be a safe guide. The friends of the Hindu can, however, point to indubitable evidence in support of some of their contentions. Ugly facts, which can neither be suppressed by officialdom nor require to be impressed upon our attention by the agitator, stand out with a prominence which cannot be gainsaid. Those who have no special knowledge of Indian affairs, nor any opportunity of acquiring such information, may well ask themselves the cause of that poverty which afflicts our Indian fellow-subjects. Why are they unable to make any provision for those disasters which periodically overtake them? Why does their industry appear so unprofitable? The climate is good, the soil of the country rich and fruitful.

Sir W. Wedderburn, in four articles reproduced from *INDIA*, endeavours to give an answer to those queries. As one who has had a long experience in our great dependency, the member for Banffshire is entitled to be heard upon the subject with which he deals. He entered the Indian Civil Service in 1859, served for a period as Acting Judge of the High Court of Bombay, and was subsequently chief secretary to the Bombay Government. It is true that some of his arguments are not new, but his statement of them is opportune, and it possesses a freshness and cogency which claim attention. Sir W. Wedderburn contends that the condition of the starving rayats is owing to their inability to secure capital at reasonable rates, and he makes certain suggestions by means of which they could obtain the financial accommodation they require. He advocates the establishment of agricultural banks. This proposal, of course, has been made before, but it failed to secure the confidence of the India Office. As far back as 1882, a banking scheme of the kind proposed took shape at Poona. After much consideration and discussion, all classes in the district were induced to approve the project. It was welcomed by the rayats; the village money-lenders promised their assistance, while the native bankers also agreed to co-operate with the promoters of the scheme. Indian officials of nearly all grades and opinions endorsed the idea. The Marquis of Ripon, who was then Viceroy, regarded it with favour; and, indeed, subject to certain conditions, the Government of India gave it support. It consented to facilitate the operations of the banks by remitting a part of the stamp duty on documents, and also a portion of the court fees in suits. In fact, the authorities in India, after having fully considered the scheme, were prepared to give it a trial.

It was, however, found impossible to secure the sanction of the India Office. Steps were taken to acquaint English public opinion with the features and objects of the scheme. Both Sir James Caird and Mr. John Bright approved of the plan. Public meetings were held in its support, and Lord Rochford—then Sir Nathaniel—was reported to have stated that there

would be no difficulty in obtaining the capital necessary to make it a success. The advocates of this plan of giving financial assistance to the rayats, however, met with no encouragement from the Imperial authorities. One delay was encountered after another, and after a voluminous correspondence had taken place upon the subject, the scheme was defeated in the House of Commons in August, 1887. Sir W. Wedderburn admits that he is unable to say who was responsible for its abandonment, though he commits himself to the statement that when it "entered the portals of the India Office it was stabbed in the dark." Since the banking scheme was drawn at Poona, similar institutions have made great progress in several European countries. In Germany alone, as Sir W. Wedderburn points there are some 2,000 such banks, doing an annual business which amounts to about 150 millions sterling. In India, however, nothing has been done; and, as a result, the rayat is still in the grip of the money-lender. Moreover, the manner in which the taxes are assessed and collected exposes the population to serious inconvenience. Indeed, if the object of the authorities had been to place the cultivator of the soil in the hands of the usurer, no more effectual method could have been adopted. The Government not only insists upon a prompt payment of the taxes but demands them before the crops are ripe. The object of this policy, we learn, is that the crop may be available for seizure in case payment is not made. It is, of course, obvious that this course must expose the struggling rayat to great hardships. He finds demands made upon him at a time when he is least able to meet them, and when his resources have been spent in cultivating his crop. It is easy to see that his burdens might be lightened by some system of financial aid, and to many the suggestion to establish agricultural banks for this purpose will seem worthy of consideration. That the majority of the Indian population should be in a condition of chronic starvation is far from creditable to British rule. At present, the unrest which prevails in certain districts is causing great anxiety. It is impossible for statesmanship to prevent the recurrence of disease and famine. At any rate the processes of prevention must be slow. The social condition of the mass of the people might, however, be improved by a more thoughtful and less expensive system of administration, so as to render them more able to withstand privations when they come.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY AND ITS FRUITS.

THE SO-CALLED "FRONTIER RISINGS."

SHALL INDIA PAY FOR IMPERIAL BLUNDERS?

In view of recent events in the regions beyond the North-West frontier of India, it may be of interest to recall briefly the so-called "frontier" wars of the last three years. On November 3, 1894, telegrams from Quetta announced an attack on Colonel Turner's camp at Wano by the Waziris, said to have been roused by the preaching of the Mullah Powindah. Severe hand-to-hand fighting took place, the attack was repulsed, and reinforcements were ordered up. In a week 5,000 men were at Wano, and reserves were being concentrated at Dera Ismail Khan. Terms were dictated to the tribesmen. The return of "stolen" arms and horses was demanded. The banishment of the Mullah and the surrender of six notorious malcontents was also insisted on. Early in December the enemy's force melted away, but on the 13th compliance with these terms was refused. Sir William Lockhart thereupon issued the usual proclamation reprobating the wrongdoings of the tribesmen, and an advance in three columns was ordered. The respective destinations of the columns, Rasmak, Makin, and Kunigaram, three villages lying at

intervals of twelve miles on a line running south-west from Rasmak, were reached with little opposition. Some of the tribes offered to come in at the beginning of January, 1895, but nothing less than a complete and general surrender of all the Mahsud Waziris was considered adequate. A few weeks were employed in destroying forts and capturing cattle. Then, on January 22, a council of chiefs met Sir William Lockhart, who dictated detailed terms, and fixed March 1 as the latest day for the fulfilment of his conditions. Within a week all except the Mullah Powindah's own tribe had come in. Nevertheless a column was detached early in February to open up the Tochi Valley, notorious in these latter days. Meanwhile the demarcation of the frontier was undertaken, and the guns and the fines and hostages imposed on the tribesmen were gradually brought in. In the first week in March the Tochi Valley was explored, and the terms imposed by Sir William Lockhart were finally complied with. The demarcation of the frontier was finished on April 5, 1895, and the troops were withdrawn. The hopes of the *Times* correspondent that an opportunity might be taken to open up the Tochi Valley, "the shortest route to Ghazni," had been realised.

Before the extinction of the feeble effort made by the Waziris the Government had blundered into a much more serious enterprise farther north. On January 11, 1895, Indian telegrams stated that in the absence of particulars about the death of Nizam-ul-Mulk of Chitral the Government would take no immediate action. Fifty Sikhs were despatched to strengthen the escort of Lieutenant Gurdon, the British Resident, who assured the authorities that there was no need for fears as to his safety. Amir-ul-Mulk, perhaps because he was of weak intellect, had escaped the general massacre which formed part of the disturbances on the death of the Mehtar, Aman-ul-Mulk in 1892. His character made him a convenient instrument of intrigue, and he was induced to murder his half-brother, Nizam-ul-Mulk, the reigning Mehtar. Dr. Robertson, who had been sent up to Chitral as political agent on receipt of the news of the Mehtar's murder, withheld for the time his recognition of the new ruler in accordance with the declared policy of the Government. This policy consisted in recognising the *de facto* ruler, and abstaining from interference in family quarrels. At the end of January Umra Khan had invaded Chitral, and on February 9 captured the important fort of Darosh on the southern road. He assured the British Commissioner in the Kumar Valley of his peaceful intentions towards the Government, and expressed a desire to make peace with Amir-ul-Mulk. Robertson had entrenched himself in Chitral fort where Amir-ul-Mulk, to whom he accorded a temporary recognition on February 14, joined him. Five hundred rifles had been pushed forward to protect the Resident, and he had supplies for six weeks. Fresh complications were introduced by the escape from Kabul of Sher Afzul, who had ruled for a few weeks in 1892 until Nizam-ul-Mulk drove him out. Supported by Umra Khan the new-comer captured Chitral, and on March 2 was recognised as ruler by the Chitralis,

who believed that the Amir had connived at his escape and supported him. The Resident abandoned the avowed policy of the Government, but his action appears to have gained official approval. He still clung to Amir-ul-Mulk and was besieged in Chitral fort. Sher Afzul complained later, not without some show of reason, that Dr. Robertson did not meet him half way when war might have been avoided by diplomacy. Telegrams on March 11 announced that anxiety was felt with regard to Dr. Robertson. Three days later Umra Khan had been warned to quit Chitral before April 1, and 14,000 men were ready to march from Peshawar. There was a consensus of opinion in India, according to the *Times* correspondent, that nothing but the strongest reasons could justify the Government in entering on a task so difficult and fraught with such great responsibilities. On the 19th a proclamation was issued declaring the intention of the Government to expel Umra Khan without permanently occupying any of the territory passed through, or injuring the tribesmen, so long as they refrained from hostilities. With the exception of the *Times of India* the Anglo-Indian Press condemned the action of the Government. Three days later news arrived that Captain Ross and 54 men had been killed on March 16 in an attempt to force a way from Mastuj, on the northern road, to Chitral. Lieutenants Fowler and Edwards were treacherously taken prisoners a day later. The advance was ordered on March 31. General Sir Robert Low, with three brigades, stormed the Malakand Pass, and occupied Aladand, Thama, and Chakdara, on the Swat river, which was bridged after infinite trouble. Colonel Kelly in vain tried to force his way through the snow-blocked passes from Gilgit, but left Captain Borradaile with 300 men to make a further effort, which proved successful after incredible exertions and suffering on the part of the troops. Colonel Kelly followed, and Mastuj was relieved on April 9, after sharp fighting. The 80 miles of country between Mastuj and Chitral were covered in ten days, and Colonel Kelly entered Chitral on April 20 without opposition. The Khan of Dir had advanced with his levies on the 18th, and Sher Afzul and Umra Khan had both retired without fighting. A week later Sher Afzul and a large number of other prisoners were brought in by the Khan of Dir, but Umra Khan had made good his escape, and was sent to Kabul by the commander-in-chief of the Amir's forces. Shuja-ul-Mulk, son of Aman-ul-Mulk, and a mere boy, was appointed Mehtar, and the question of the future administration of Chitral was discussed. General Gatacre, with a flying column, reached Chitral on May 10, and Sir Robert Low entered the town a week later. Arrangements were made for a permanent camp at Kala Darosh, a fortified post garrisoned by one regiment at Ohakdara, and a brigade in camp at Malakand. The road from Chitral to Darosh is held by the native regiments stationed at Darosh, from Darosh to Dir by Chitral levies, and from Dir to Chakdara by the Khan of Dir's levies. The withdrawal of the first detachment of troops in the face of tribes "ready to spring to arms again on the slightest pretext" was accomplished amid congratulations from the same correspondents who, a few

weeks later, discovered that the Chitralis were petitioning the British army to remain. The decision of Lord Salisbury's Government to remain at Chitral—a decision rendered possible by the General Election of 1895—was "warmly approved" at Simla. Simla opinion in August being obviously at variance with Anglo-Indian opinion generally in March. Shuja-ul-Mulk, with three headmen, formed a council, advised by the British Resident, for the administration of a mutilated Chitral.

Only a very superficial observer could have supposed the arrangements thus made to be permanent. On June 10 last the Waziris again initiated what has proved to be a widespread movement by an attack on Mr. Gee's escort at Dotoi, in the Toshi Valley. A retreat on Sherani was carried out with little loss, and reinforcements from Datta Khel, 15 miles away, repulsed the enemy. Unfortunately the few losses comprised, as is usual in these costly frontier expeditions, an unduly large proportion of British officers. A week later Simla had ordered a punitive expedition of two brigades, under Major-General Corrie Bird, and the proceedings of two years ago are being repeated. There is no organised opposition, though the Waziris carry on a desultory guerilla warfare. The inevitable proclamation was issued on July 14, and since that date the British forces have scoured the district, destroying fortifications and raiding cattle, while the tribes make reprisal by cutting of camels and supplies whenever they find opportunity.

Disturbances in Waziristan were followed by hostilities further north. Thana was the scene of the new outbreak. The "Mad Mullah" was reported to have been preaching a *jihad* in the Swat Valley, and succeeded in rousing the tribesmen to a determined attack on Malakand on the nights of July 26 to 28. Colonel Meiklejohn abandoned the weak north camp and retired within his entrenchments. A squadron of Bengal lancers got through to Ohakdara, nine miles away, to strengthen the garrison there, and the Guides were ordered up from Hasi Mardan, near Peshawar. Reinforcements were rapidly moved up and operations ordered on an extensive scale, under Sir Bindon Blood. Ohakdara was relieved on August 2, just in time to forestall an attack by 6,000 tribesmen, and the garrison was doubled. The enemy suffered heavy losses in the fighting round Ohakdara, and the Khan of Dir reported that he was dealing with those of his own people who had joined the attack.

Afghan regulars are said to have joined in the fighting, and the Amir's agents are reported to have been recalled from Bombay, Calcutta, Simla, and Karachi. The Mullah of Hadda raised a force of several thousand men to join in the attack on Malakand. His action was anticipated by the relief of Malakand, and he turned on Fort Shabkadr, 18 miles north of Peshawar. Here he was defeated with his Mohmand followers on August 9. Even the Afridis have taken up arms after years of tranquillity, and on August 24 captured Fort Maude in the Khyber Pass. Everything points to a widespread and determined revolt against the encroachments of the Government of India beyond the Indus—a signal illustration of the monstrous follies of the "for-

ward" policy which, under the pretext of securing a scientific frontier, is at once breaking down the natural defences of India, annihilating brave tribesmen who might in case of emergency have proved staunch allies, and spreading discontent among Indian taxpayers burdened with the enormous cost of a policy they hate and distrust.

II.—SIR JOHN ADYE'S VIEW.

General Sir John Abye wrote to the *Times* of August 12 as follows:—

I trust that those who are interested in the many difficult questions connected with our Empire in India, and more especially with our policy on the North-West Frontier, are watching the progress of events in the Swat Valley; and are not led astray by the assertion that it is a mere fanatical outbreak led by a so-called mad Mullah. In my opinion its cause lies far deeper, and is a direct outcome of what is termed the forward policy—that is, of forcing ourselves and our authority upon the independent border tribes who inhabit the secluded valleys far away amidst the great mountain ridges which radiate southerly from the many crests of the Hindu Kush. Let me recapitulate a little. When, early in 1895, our representative in Chitral, with a small force, was surrounded and in great peril, it became necessary to move troops of all arms, and in considerable numbers, from our frontier station at Peshawar and other places as quickly as possible to prevent a catastrophe. To effect our object, however, it also became necessary, in order to reach the distant valley of Chitral, that we should enter and pass across the adjacent valley of Swat and other territory inhabited by independent tribes, with whom we had no cause of quarrel, and who naturally might resent the appearance of our troops amongst them. At the commencement of the short campaign of 1895 we therefore issued a proclamation pointing out the circumstances, and assuring them that when our object had been achieved we would withdraw our forces and would in no way interfere with the independence and liberties of the mountain tribes whose territories we were compelled temporarily to traverse.

The expedition of 1895 was rapidly and successfully carried out; and so far as the military operations were concerned, nothing could have been more satisfactory. But when the war was over and our representative and small garrison had been released, we changed our policy, and instead of withdrawing from the country have continued to occupy it; have constructed a road and established permanent fortified posts along the line of communication from our territory to the far distant valley of Chitral. It is said that we have thus improved the condition of the inhabitants, have prevented feudatory incursions, and that we may therefore expect them gradually to become friendly neighbours.

I cannot for myself see that we have a right to expect any such result from what has been on our part practically a breach of faith and an assumption of authority in a country which did not belong to us. And now suddenly, when little more than two years have elapsed since we first entered the country, we

find that the Swat tribes have broken out into insurrection, and with great vigour have attacked our posts; and have thus compelled us for a second time to send troops in great haste and at great cost over the border to save our beleaguered garrisons. The assertion is made that the outbreak is a mere isolated adventure by a few fanatical followers of a mad Mullah; but it is also admitted that they have already lost upwards of 3,000 men killed, besides large numbers of wounded; and, in my opinion, it is idle and foolish to represent it as a mere fanatical outbreak when it is evidently the outcome—the natural outcome—of what on our part is called a forward policy, and which, if persisted in, will lead us on into an indefinite number of expeditions very costly in themselves and unjust to the tribes concerned.

Where are we going to stop?

It must always be borne in mind that the tribes who inhabit the secluded valleys in the vast mountainous regions on our north-west frontier, though turbulent, poor, and half-civilised, are very brave and hardy; they are deeply attached to their families, and have a great love of their country and cherish its independence. In short, they possess qualities which we rightly admire in ourselves, and therefore deserve our respect and consideration.

These independent tribes inhabit a great mountain region, for the most part almost inaccessible, and if instead of involving ourselves in incessant frontier wars we would pursue with them the policy of conciliation and subsidies, which we now follow so successfully with their powerful neighbour the ruler of Afghanistan, we should in time secure their friendship and put an end to expeditions which, as I have pointed out, are unjust in policy and disastrous in a financial point of view.

There are many authorities, civil and military, who have had long experience in India, and especially in our North-Western Provinces, who, I believe, will agree with the views which I have expressed as to the policy which should be pursued with our brave, but somewhat turbulent, neighbours over the border.

III.—COLONEL HANNA'S VIEW.

Colonel H. B. Hanna wrote to the *Saturday Review* of August 7:—

In an article entitled "The Chitral Decision" which appeared in this Review on August 17, 1895, I pointed out the danger of isolating a small body of troops in Chitral and entrusting its precarious communications to tribal levies, raised from a people whose country we had just occupied, in violation of solemn pledges given them by the Indian Government.

What is the State of affairs to-day? The tribes whose opposition we escaped, two years ago, by deluding them with false promises, see in the impoverished and weakened condition of India, just emerging from famine and plague, and stirred, in parts at least, by resentment and discontent, the necessary favourable opportunity for regaining their independence. Within thirty miles of our old frontier they have surrounded two outposts, shut up

3,000 troops in an entrenched position, and compelled the Indian Government to mobilise other 12,000 men at the hottest and unhealthiest season of the year. 15,000 men will more than suffice to deal with the Swatis alone, but how if their fighting strength of 9,000 men is reinforced by 8,000 Bunerwals, 5,000 Utman Khels and 20,000 Mohmands? And who shall guarantee us against the contagion of revolt spreading to yet more distant tribes or against the danger of complications arising, through the Mohmands, with the Amir of Afghanistan, whose subjects they really are, though we claim to exercise a protectorate over some of them?

Meantime, what is happening in Chitral? The Indian Government is trying to communicate the fact of the Swati rising to the troops there in order that they may be on their guard and take all precautions for their own safety; but no one knows whether they have not already to deal with a rising of their own, and it is certain that help cannot reach them except *via* Gilgit till the hostile gatherings in the Malakand Pass have been entirely dispersed. Fortunately they are provisioned till next May, by which time we shall certainly have beaten the Swatis, if the revolt is confined to them, and probably have broken down even the largest combination that could be formed against us, Afghanistan excluded. But it will not be as easy as some people would have us believe. When a Reuter's telegram comments with complacency on the forced inaction of the British as likely to encourage a concentration of the enemy and thus enable us, on the arrival of reinforcements, to crush the rising at one blow, the man who sent it lays bare his own ignorance of the tactics of these mountaineers. If tribal gatherings kindly waited to suit our convenience and then allowed us to draw them into fighting pitched battles, the question of the wisdom of these occupations of their territories might be answered differently; but this is the very thing that they carefully avoid doing. When we concentrate they disperse, to close in again as we divide our forces—as divide them we must where long lines of communications have to be held—and crushing blows never have a chance of being delivered.

Still, when it comes to fighting we may count on beating our enemies in the end; only our victories in these mountainous countries are barren of results and win for us but a precarious peace. Over and over again the same work has to be done, at the same cost, and never to any good end. In all our new territories, from Quetta to Gilgit, there is nothing worth possessing, *except the confidence of the tribes*, and that, which under the frontier system established by Sir John Lawrence we were slowly but surely gaining, the forward policy has killed. Is there no hope that this fresh object-lesson may open the eyes of the British people to the folly of ruining India for the sake of protecting her against imaginary dangers? imaginary because, if it is so difficult for us to keep open the communications of a stationary force at Chitral, only 160 miles from our border, against the attacks of two or three tribes, the difficulties of Russian armies as they drew ever further and further away from their base would be nothing less than insuperable. This being

a truth from which there is no escaping, will a Government whose own principal military advisers were opposed to the retention of Chitral persist in an occupation the fruits of which are, and ever will be, periodic wars resulting in a heavy drain upon India's dwindling resources?

The *Times* of August 10 contained the following letter from Colonel H. B. Hanna:

Will you grant me a little space in your columns in which to point out to your readers that by abandoning our Indian frontier we have lost all freedom of initiative as regards the independent tribes and must willy-nilly dance to their piping? In former days, when their territories lay beyond our advanced posts, if a tribe misbehaved at an inconvenient season of the year, we just shut up the outlets of its valleys, closed our markets to its traders, and waited quietly till it submitted or till it suited us to inflict upon it a more active punishment; and when we did move against it, in late autumn or early spring, it was with comparatively small forces, strong enough, however, to coerce an enemy whose stores of grain at the one season, whose growing crops at the other, and whose herds of cattle at both, were at our mercy so long as snow cut them off from their summer hiding places. This power of choice we possessed, because in the interval of waiting no life for which the Indian Government was responsible was in danger.

To-day, with small bodies of native or mixed troops pushed up hundreds of miles beyond our main line of defence, and with their communications in the hands of a long succession of tribes, the moment a rising occurs (always at the worst time of year for us) other troops must be hurried forward to the rescue of their comrades, at any cost of suffering and life—only those who have experienced it know what that suffering is—not a couple of squadrons or a regiment or two, as of old, but a couple of brigades, or, as is the case at this moment looking both to Tochi and Malakand, a couple of divisions, whilst money must be poured out like water on a transport which melts away as it moves. A precarious peace is all that these heavy sacrifices have gained for us in the past or can gain for us in the future unless we are prepared to hold in force the whole of the 78,000 square miles of rock and stone added to our Indian empire since 1878. That would mean the location of, at least, 40,000 troops in those miserable and unhealthy regions, every man of that number costing India three times what she has to pay for him within her true limits. Let the thousands of Englishmen who support the forward policy without troubling their heads to ask what it involves sit down and count the cost of making it successful, or at least safe, or even the cost of leaving it in its present state of crude and weak development dependent from day to day upon the forbearance of men whom we have no right to trust, not because they are treacherous, but because it lies in the nature of things that they should be our foes—and when they have counted, let them say whether the game is worth the candle. No compensation for our vast expenditure can ever be wrung out of the tribes; we cannot disarm them as we have disarmed the inhabitants of flat and cultivated countries whose conduct we could control at all times and seasons; and we cannot conciliate them because, though they may take our subsidies, money is in their eyes a poor equivalent for a loss of any portion of their independence.

"This may be all true," some persons may answer, "and yet no reason for losing our faith in the forward policy. Necessity can take no account of losses and difficulties, and if we must occupy these unprofitable countries to keep them from falling into Russia's hands, there is no use grumbling or looking back."

Yes, if we must; but let the men who talk like this open their eyes and see and understand the object-lesson which is being given for their instruction. Does not every fresh incident of the policy to which they cling teach the futility of the fears out of which it sprang? Can any man capable of putting two and two together read morning after morning in your pages the accounts of the efforts being put forth by the Indian Government to restore peace at a point but thirty miles from our frontier and seriously believe that Russian soldiers will ever cross the Swat river, whether we hold or abandon Chitral?

"But we are there, have been there two years; it is too late to go back." That is the last argument of the man convinced against his will. From a wrong path which we recognize as wrong we can go back if we choose, and in this particular case withdrawal is not only possible but easy, for no one concerned wants us to persist in our error. Not India, who protested against it at the time and groans under every addition to her military burdens; not the troops, who hate service far from their homes in strange and trying conditions; not the tribes, who ask nothing better than to be allowed to return to their old relations with us, relations under which—slowly, indeed, but surely—confidence and friendly feeling was growing up between us and them, not at this point alone, but all along the North-West frontier, as is conclusively shown by the absence of all punitive expeditions during the five years immediately preceding the resuscitation of the forward policy by Lord Lytton.

IV.—MR. ROMESH CHUNDER DUTT'S SUGGESTION.

We take the following from Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt's article in the August number of the *Fortnightly Review* :—

Sir Henry Fowler, when discussing the question of the present famine in the House of Commons, remarked :—"If it should prove to be the fact, notwithstanding the surplus of which the noble lord (Lord George Hamilton) has spoken, that this famine will entail, as I am afraid it will, a very considerable charge upon the revenues of India, for the loss from the land revenue will be considerable, I think that it is time for this House, and I am sure this House will be representing the people of the country—in the same spirit in which it made contribution in the case of the Afghan War to the Indian Exchequer—to make an Imperial contribution to the Exchequer of India in aid of the taxation of India." I am convinced my countrymen will appreciate the noble spirit in which this suggestion was made. But, nevertheless, if I am capable of forming a judgment in the matter, it is not in this shape that a contribution from the British Exchequer will be most acceptable to them. India has always paid for her internal administration, and while the people of the country desire to see economy enforced, they do not desire that a new departure should now be made, and that India should from time to time obtain donations from the British Exchequer for her internal administration.

The reference which Sir Henry Fowler made to the contribution made on the occasion of the Afghan War suggests the true and only method in which England could grant relief to India with justice, and India could receive it with dignity. India now pays not only for her internal administration, not only for the army and defensive works within her own limits, but also for the maintenance of England's Empire in Asia outside the limits of India. Burma, including the Shan States, is as large as France, and borders on the dominions of France and China. British possessions in the wilds of Beluchistan, Afghanistan and Chitral extend for hundreds of miles beyond the natural limits of India, and the expensiveness of the occupation and defence of these places is alarming. Little income is derived from the Shan States of Burma, or from Beluchistan, from Chitral or from Afghanistan, and India is bled for much of the cost of maintaining these portions

of England's Asiatic Empire. England is the richest country in the world, India is one of the poorest. And yet India is made to pay for England's possessions and wars in Asia beyond her own natural boundaries.

Forty years ago, when India passed under the direct rule of the Crown, a pledge was given that the cost of wars outside India would not be charged to India. Within the period of forty years the limits of England's Asiatic Empire (miscalled India) have been extended to the frontiers of China in the east, and have been pushed forward into Afghanistan, Beluchistan and Tartary in the west; and the cost of these outside extensions has been charged to India. And within this period the expenses of India have so enormously increased that every responsible Indian statesman has been filled with anxiety, and every method of taxation, bearing more and more severely on the people, has been tried with poor and ghastly results. We seem to be coming back in despair to taxes which every civilised country has discarded. A scheme to re-impose tolls on roads and to levy a tax on every marriage is now under the consideration of the Bengal Government.

At such a time of need India can legitimately ask England to contribute a share of the vast military expenditure required to sustain her Asiatic Empire. It may be possible to ascertain roughly what proportion of the military expenditure of India is incurred for the occupation and defence of the frontier tracts outside India. And as the people of England are disposed, judging from Sir Henry Fowler's speech, to give some substantial relief to India out of the English Exchequer, the shape in which such relief would be most acceptable, as well as most equitable, would be the contribution of this proportion of the military expenditure, which India is no longer able to bear alone.

V.—"WE TOLD YOU SO."

In view of the events which are now taking place in the regions lying beyond the North-West frontier of India, it may be interesting to reproduce the article which was printed in INDIA for March, 1896, under the heading, "The Chitral Amendment: The Nescience of Lord G. Hamilton." The article was written with reference to the debate on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the Address (February 17, 1896), which was in the following terms :—

"But we humbly express our regret that the present Government, reversing the policy of their predecessors, have decided not to withdraw from Chitral, thereby violating the pledge expressly given in the Viceroy's proclamation, dangerously adding to Government responsibilities beyond the North-West frontier of India and inevitably leading to an increase of the overgrown expenditure in the Indian Military Department, and further our regret that the treaty of 1893 with the Amir of Afghanistan has not been placed before Parliament."

Our article was as follows :—

Lord George Hamilton deprecated, in vehement and occasionally abusive language, the allegation that the retention of Chitral involved a breach of faith, and asked, rhetorically, if Sir W. Wedderburn was acquainted with the facts of the case.

Lord George Hamilton's amazing speech suggests

—not rhetorically—the same question with reference to himself.

The Viceroy's proclamation, he said, "merely applied to the territory between Peshawar and Chitral, and it had absolutely nothing to do with the people of Chitral."

The proclamation is given in full at page 39 of the Blue-book (C.—7,864), "Correspondence relating to Chitral." It contains these two explicit undertakings:—

(i) "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present, and prevent any future, unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained, the force will be withdrawn.

(ii) "The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes."

Each of these two promises was supplementary of the other. The first promised withdrawal from Chitral; the second promised that no intervening territory should be occupied. Taken together, these promises amounted to a complete pledge against occupation, and the question to whom they were addressed is a question of purely academic interest.

That the proclamation was intended to convey this meaning is conclusively shown by the Chitral Blue-book.

The date of the proclamation (which was not merely issued to the people of Swat and Bajaur, but was also "generally communicated upon the border") was March 14, 1895. On March 8 Lord Elgin had telegraphed to Sir H. Fowler that certain measures were necessary to "ensure" the "safety" of Dr. Robertson, and on the same day Sir H. Fowler had replied:—

"I am prepared to approve such action for securing safety of Robertson and party as you may deem necessary."

The proclamation was issued after the receipt of this reply, and it expressly stated that the purpose of the relief expedition was to compel Umra Khan to retire from Chitral.

Note Sir Henry Fowler's words "action for securing safety of Robertson and party." On March 18 Lord Elgin telegraphed that orders had been issued for the mobilisation of the first division of the field army. At once—on the same day—Sir H. Fowler telegraphed to Lord Elgin:—

"Please let me know why so large a force is considered necessary for securing safety of Robertson and party."

Again we have the phrase "securing safety of Robertson and party." There was not even a hint at that time—the time at which the proclamation was issued—of retention or occupation. Moreover, when the Government of India afterwards suggested the idea, Sir Henry Fowler replied (June 13, 1895. Blue-book p. 51):—

"Her Majesty's Government . . . have decided that no military force or European agent shall be kept at Chitral, that Chitral shall be fortified, and that no road shall be made between Peshawar and Chitral. It will follow that all positions beyond our frontier, now held in consequence of the recent relief operations, should be evacuated as speedily as circumstances allow."

This was manifestly Sir H. Fowler's policy and intention from the outset. The expedition was a relief expedition, pure and simple. When Lord George Hamilton succeeded Sir H. Fowler, he per-

mitted the Government of India to reverse this policy and to occupy Chitral, and he now vainly seeks to justify a glaring breach of faith on the ground that Chitral is "a much richer country than was anticipated." It would be an odd thing if a man charged with burglary sought to defend himself on the ground that his booty proved more valuable than he had anticipated.

Lord George Hamilton's assertion that the people of Chitral "welcome the English occupation" is open to two criticisms. The first is that, even if it were founded on fact, it would still be irrelevant. The second is that we have heard the same sort of thing before. In fact, Lord George Hamilton was answered in advance by Sir Auckland Colvin. In the *Nineteenth Century* for November last Sir Auckland Colvin wrote:—

"For the moment, all is painted *coulour de rose*. The Swat tribesmen, if Simla telegrams may be trusted, are not content merely to condone our occupation of such points in their territory as Chakdara and the Malakand Pass. They insist in demanding that the Government of India should administer their country. They would even be mortified at the refusal of their request. If this is so, nothing could be happier. . . . Still, it is well to recall to mind that something very like it has been heard on previous and analogous occasions. Events which belied the accuracy of precisely similar assertions in 1838 are now so distant that their echo has become well-nigh inaudible. But some may remember, and those who have forgotten may be reminded, that in 1838 there were not wanting voices which loudly proclaimed the delight of the Afghan nation at their deliverance from their elected ruler. Four years later, when Afghanistan had unmistakably spoken for itself, those voices were conspicuously silent. It came at length to be recognised that among the Afghans were many who, from complaisance, from compulsion, or from cunning, had protested too much; and whose too effusive expressions of welcome had misled many who were in haste to credit them. With that experience in our minds, it will be as well to suspend judgment as to the credence to be placed in the reports which reach us of the pleasure of the tribesmen at the permanent settlement of British troops within their borders. All that as yet can be seen clearly is that there has been made by the Government of India a fresh departure, which may lead to grave complications, either in the immediate or in a more distant future."

As for the cost of this "forward" move, Lord G. Hamilton said in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn that "he thought the expenditure would be less than was anticipated, and, so far from Indian finance being in a critical condition, they must bear in mind that there had been a considerable remission of taxation by the reduction in the cotton duties." In the same strain of ludicrous optimism Lord George, at the close of his speech, "congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned." Against Lord George Hamilton's congratulations and beliefs we may well set the reasoned conclusions of an ex-Finance Minister like Sir Auckland Colvin. In the article in the *Nineteenth Century* from which we have already quoted, Sir A. Colvin wrote:—

"The situation . . . is surrounded by clouds and darkness. Is it a time to prophesy smooth things, to smile complacently, to exchange congratulations, to talk comfortably about the clouds going by? It seems, indeed, difficult to understand how it can be believed that the financial outlook, as was said

in the recent Indian Budget debates, is better than it was three years ago. Three years ago the necessity of re-imposing the cotton duties had not been demonstrated. The Famine Grant had not been appropriated to current revenues. Three years ago the Secretary of State sold his bills at 1s. 2½d.; at present he barely touches 1s. 1½d. The deficit three years ago was Rs. 800,000; now it is estimated at well over a million. For, three years ago, the forward frontier policy had been but recently revived, and we had not made the progress in creating and completing our new dominion and protectorate beyond the Indus which has been achieved of late. Frontier policy and Indian finance are as inseparable as foreign policy and finance in Western countries. There can be no improvement in Indian finance so long as Indian revenues are depicted by the claims of frontier extension, or exposed to the risk and requirements of war. Consequently there can be no vigorous internal policy, whether of railway development or of other kind. The most experienced are the first to recognise this. 'We know,' it was said in the course of the Chitral debate, 'that at the India Office, and among retired officers, the old-fashioned view prevails. But in India, and it is there where most responsibility rests, opinion is almost invariably opposed to it.' This reminds us of that other *dictum*, in its time also accepted, that 'the opinion of Colley on the frontier question was worth that of twenty Lawrence.' The 'old-fashioned' view has been indicated in the course of this paper, and in the words of its first and greatest exponent. It is the old-fashioned view to 'protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling as it is, to bear such pressure even for measures which they can both understand and appreciate.' It is the old-fashioned view to 'look for our true policy, our strongest security in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses, in husbanding the finances of India, and in consolidating and multiplying its resources.' If in India, where most responsibility lies, these views are no longer in favour, let us learn why they have been discarded, and what are the views by which they have been replaced. If, on the other hand, their importance is still admitted, let us be told how they are to be made consistent with the present forward policy. Economy, the contentment of our Indian fellow-subjects, and multiplying the resources of British India may be merely the old-fashioned views of the India Office, of retired officers, of dead Viceroy, and of other unconsidered obscurities. But they are, at least, the views which in building up India in the past guided the great men who were charged with the task, and which enabled them to hand over the India of the present day, such as we still see it, to the men who are now responsible. Old-fashioned as they are, they are, therefore, views which will continue to challenge and command consideration till they have been proved unsuited to the India of the future."

These weighty words of Sir Auckland Colvin's, with their contempt of complacent smiles and congratulations, were, it seems, prophetic.

VI.—SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

WHAT THE "FORWARD" POLICY MEANS.

British India is defended on the north-west by a desert of stone and snow. It is so barren that an invading army would have to carry all the food needed by men and beasts for the passage across it. But it is so broad that a baggage mule, the hardest of beasts, could scarcely carry enough provender to keep itself alive on the way. That is to say, it is impassable. India on that side is as safe as a house surrounded by a quicksand. Nature has interposed between her and her enemies that which can be trusted to deal with them if it is left as it is. But the Indian "forward" party will not trust it, and will not leave it as it is. They insist on throwing out into this waste of peaks and ridges, whose desolation is India's defence, long tentacles of military road and of political intrigue. It is as if a commander whose position was securely defended by a deep moat should throw in earth and make it shallower, so that the garrison might wade out and meet the enemy half way. The desert beyond the frontier is a sure defence to India, because there are no roads and no telegraphs, because there is no food, and because the mountaineers are wild and fanatical, and would without fail fall upon any force which tried to pass through their mountains to India. The "forward"

party hope to amend the frontier by cutting roads and stretching telegraph wires, and dotting the desert with military and civil stations. They have a theory that the more the mountain tribes are beaten the better they will like us. Every few years a new point in the wilderness catches their fancy, and we must needs rush out and seize it. They already hint pretty plainly that the whole of the 800 miles of borderland from Quetta to the country north of Gilgit ought to be occupied, at the cost of many campaigns as serious as the Chitral campaign and endless "frontier incidents," as serious as the fighting at Malakand. Of course India, in spite of plague and famine, would have to pay for it all. Her people cannot afford to buy proper food, and yet they have to find money for the conversion of a first-rate into a second-rate frontier, in spite of the warnings of administrative and military experts quite as competent as those who advocate the change. The situation ought to be seriously studied by the unreflecting people who are now writing as if every Indian difficulty could be solved by suppressing Indian newspapers.—*Manchester Guardian*, July 29.

WANTED: A LITTLE STATESMANLIKE PRUDENCE.

Much of the trouble and anxiety which now perplex the Government of India might have been avoided by the exercise of a little statesmanlike prudence. The attack upon the camp at Malakand and the consequent renewal of the war in Chitral are directly and inevitably due to the precipitate action of her Majesty's Ministers in deciding to retain the Swat valley. Lord Salisbury and his colleagues had only been in office a few hours when they reversed the deliberate policy of their predecessors and gave their sanction to a breach of faith. After the gallant and successful rescue of Sir George Robertson by Sir Robert Low, the Government were pledged to retire and to leave these mountain tribes in the enjoyment of their previous independence. But the chance of annexation was too much for them, and they determined that, in the words of Mr. Balfour, whose martial ardour is almost as ludicrous as Mr. Goschen's, where British troops, or native troops under British officers, had gone, there the British flag should remain. We have it on the authority of Lord Rosebery that the members of his Cabinet, who carefully considered the question in all its aspects, and took the responsibility of overruling the Indian Government, were absolutely unanimous in favour of the evacuation of Chitral.—*Speaker*, August 7.

THE PRICE OF THE FORWARD POLICY.

There can be no doubt that after much bloodshed the rising will be put down. But if a wiser policy had been adopted, it would never have occurred. The Ameer himself, as well as the native tribes, has been thoroughly irritated and alarmed. This little war, which it may be hoped will not become a big one, is part of the price we pay for the forward policy. If it were worth while the British public would readily acquiesce. There is nothing so quickly condoned as a profitable annexation. But it is not worth while. We have gained nothing by the permanent occupation of Chitral. We have lost the confidence of the natives, and the security which that confidence engenders. Lord Dufferin by judicious diplomacy kept Abdul Rahman quiet, and he had been quiet ever since. He had his subsidy, and it was not his interest to intrigue against his paymasters. But for the sake of retaining a post which, from a military point of view, is worthless, we have thoroughly frightened him, so that he does not know how long his own dominions may be left in his possession. It is a thousand pities. Wise statesmen had by patience and courtesy obliterated the effect of Lord Lytton's evil and mischievous policy. The annexation of Chitral has revived the old suspicious dread of British encroachment, and made enemies of those who would gladly be our friends.—*Daily News*, August 19.

"THE INTERESTINGNESS OF LIFE."

We suppose the Indian highlanders will become quiet after a time, but we are by no means sure that that opinion is not a bit of optimism. We cannot find them lands sufficient to make their lives comfortable. We cannot completely disarm them. We cannot deprive local chiefs of authority, for if we did it would all pass to much more dangerous Moolahs and headmen elected principally by their influence. We cannot alter their creed, which is essentially a creed for unscrupulous warriors. We can subsidise the chiefs, we can cut roads, and we can foster the habit of seeking careers within the native States, but we can do little more, and when we have done that

the two grand difficulties remain. The clans want something to eat, and something to do which born fighting men will look at. It is the difficulty of providing the latter which is the first permanent difficulty of our rule in India. We destroy of necessity the interestingness of life. We cannot, and do not, find careers for anyone who is not either of the *bourgeois* or of the professional type, and there are millions of men in India whom those two types do not include. It is useless to ask for a remedy. There is no remedy, unless, indeed, we should need and be able to pay, clouds of Indian soldiers for the garrison of tropical Africa, and that day though it is coming, is as yet far off.—*Spectator*, July 31.

THE CHITRAL PROCLAMATION.

The Indian Government has to make sure of its superiority in the field, if it takes the field at all; and to make sure of its superiority it has to make a serious addition to the military expenditure which is crushing the poorer taxpayers of India down to the earth. This calamity—an economic calamity if not a military one—answers in a painful fashion the speech made by Lord George Hamilton last year in defence of the policy of keeping Chitral and the road to it in violation of the Viceroy's promise. The famous proclamation promised that the Indian Government would not occupy any of the territories between Peshawar and Chitral, and that it would not "interfere with the independence of the tribes" inhabiting them. It was put to Lord George Hamilton that the promise was broken by the planting of a row of fortified posts and the making of a British military road between Peshawar and Chitral. To us the proposition seemed reasonable. We cannot but feel that if Russia were to insist on making and maintaining by means of Russian garrisons a military road through Afghanistan for Russia's convenience in invading British India, the independence and territorial integrity of Afghanistan would be impaired. Or to take a more extreme case, it does seem to us that our independence would be interfered with if the German Emperor or the Tsar proceeded to make military roads and to build and garrison forts at any points which they thought proper between Dover and London. It is not, to our thinking, an extravagant conception of tribal or national independence which asks that other States should not make gaps in the strong natural frontier of the independent tribe or nation and garrison commanding points in its territory. To Lord George Hamilton it seemed otherwise. The tribes, he said, with an air of conscious conclusiveness, had not complained of any broken promise. Therefore it was outrageous that members of the House of Commons should complain of one.—*Manchester Guardian*, August 3.

While Nero was fiddling Rome was burning, and while Lord George Hamilton has been amusing Primrose Leagues (we notice that his last little speech was at another of these undignified gatherings), the great dependency which he is supposed to watch has been the scene of unwonted excitement, misery, and crime.—*Leeds Mercury*, July 28.

No man fights with so much courage and persistency as the religious fanatic, and there has been plenty of this kind of fighting in the Swat Valley. But there is now every reason to hope that the difficulty there will soon be at an end, and that it is not likely to recur. Unfortunately, however, small frontier wars are very costly, and this is one reason why the Indian Government is not in a better financial position. Whenever order has been permanently established—and there is no reason why this should not be done soon—the Indian Government will probably be able to reduce its expenditure.—*Nottingham Guardian*, August 7.

The Indian Government will be greatly affected for some time to come in its finances, and it must be assisted. Perhaps, when the worst has passed and the expenditure has been carefully calculated, along with the absolute loss of all rent from the farmers, it may be worth considering whether the Home Government should not vote national money to the assistance of Indian revenue. There has never been a famine in India so disastrous as the present one has been, and it will be absolutely imperative to ascertain whether the increased poverty of the lower classes in India has not been as operative in bringing it about as the failure of the rains.—*Swiss Daily News*.

INDIANS AND THE "DIAMOND JUBILEE."

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has received the following communication from the Home Secretary:—

Whitehall, August 3, 1897.

Sir,—I have had the honour to lay before the Queen the loyal and dutiful address of a conference of Indians resident in the United Kingdom congratulating her Majesty on the completion of the sixtieth year of her reign, and I have to inform you that her Majesty was pleased to receive the same very graciously.

The other matters referred to in the address will be considered by her Majesty's advisers.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) M. W. RIDLEY.

Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.,

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road,
Southfields, S.W.

The notices of motion now standing in the Order-book of the House of Commons include the following:

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To move, That this House views with grave disapproval the fact that famine, plague, and pestilence in India have been seized by the Indian Government for an attack on the freedom of the press in India, and for the revival of the system of arrest of British subjects in India under the law of *lettres de cachet*, and the indefinite imprisonment without trial of persons thus arrested; and desires to place on record its conviction that the only safe foundation for government in India is to be sought in the extension to British subjects in India of the full privileges of the British constitution.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: To move, That looking to the condition of the masses of the Indian people and their grievous sufferings during the present year, this House desires to express its deep sympathy in their distress, and trusts that Her Majesty's Government will institute a detailed and searching Village Enquiry into the causes which blight the industry of the cultivators and render them helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine and pestilence.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH: To call attention to the great loss and suffering caused to India by plague, famine, and earthquake, and to the desirability of the Home Government endeavouring to mitigate that distress by making a grant to the Indian Government for additional relief to the sufferers; and also to the need of more effective representation of Indian opinion in the Government of the country, so that greater economy may be practised in military expenditure, and more attention paid to internal reforms, especially in the direction of larger irrigation works and more extended elementary education.

SIR M. BROWNAGGER: To move, That this House views with concern the fact that the old industries of India are fast disappearing without being replaced by new ones to any appreciable extent, with the result that its vast population has to largely depend on the imports of foreign manufactures for even the most ordinary articles of every-day use, a circumstance to which is mainly due the condition of poverty under which large sections of the people of India still labour; and that, inasmuch, as the present system of education, among other causes, has had a tendency to divert the energies of the people from the preservation and development of industrial pursuits, this House is of opinion that an enquiry should be held, by such means as the Government of India consider advisable, with a view to ascertaining and suggesting measures for remedying the evils indicated.

MR. JAMES STUART: To call attention to the reply of the Government of India to the despatch of the Secretary of State of March 26 last, relating to the health of the Indian army; and to move, That this House disapproves of the repeal of the Cantonment Act Amendment Act of 1896.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JULY, 1897.

- BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. Crosthwaite, Sir C. H. T., "Thakur Pertab Singh; a Tale of an Indian Famine."
 CATHOLIC WORLD. "Catholic Education in India."
 CENTURY MAGAZINE. Seton-Karr, H. W., "After Big Game in Africa and India."
 GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE. Reid, Donald N., "Victims of Circumstances in India."
 HUMANITARIAN. Tooley, Sarah A., "Mrs. F. A. Steel on the Social Condition of India: Interview."
 INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. Cook, J., M.A., "Indian Colleges and Universities." Harvey, Dr. R., "In Memoriam: P. Sundram Pillai."
 LIPPINCOTT'S MONTHLY MAGAZINE. Clark, Francis E., "Bombay: a Plague-Stricken City."
 SUNDAY AT HOME. "Famine Relief Work in India."
 WINDSOR MAGAZINE. Bolton, Gambier, "The Wild Monkeys of India."

AUGUST, 1897.

- BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. "The Native Army of India."
 CASSELL'S MAGAZINE. "The Cotton Industry in India."
 CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. Ghosh, Prof. A. S., "A Remedy for Indian Famines."
 COSMOPOLITAN. Hawthorne, Julian, "The Horrors of the Plague in India."
 EDINBURGH REVIEW. "The Native States of India."
 FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. Dutt, Romesh C., "Famines in India and their Remedy." Hankin, John E. O., "Indian Spelling: Old Friends with a New Face." Bhow-nagregre, Sir M. M., "The Present Agitation in India."
 INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. Vyasji, Saligram, "Jubilee Guests." Naidu, P. V., "Social Intercourse in India."
 INVESTOR'S REVIEW. "Indian Finance and England's Duty." "Indian Tea Companies in 1896."
 MADRAS REVIEW. S. R. M., "Commercial Morality in Madras." C., "Indians in South Africa." Chinnaswami, P., "Prison Life in Madras." "Women in Ancient India."
 PAUL MALL MAGAZINE. Forrest, Prof. G. W., "Bombay: A Capital of Greater Britain."
 UNITED SERVICE MAGAZINE. Mayne, Major C. B., "Protective Measures for the Troops in India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JULY, 1897.

- COWELL, PROF. E. B. "The Jataka, or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births." Vol. III. (The University Press) 12s. 6d.
 MUIR, SIR WILLIAM "The Muhammadan Controversy: Biographies of Muhammad: Sprenger on Tradition; The Indian Liturgy and the Psalter. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh) 7s. 6d.
 RANBOME, CYRIL "Our Colonies and India." (Cassell and Co.) 1s. 0d.

AUGUST, 1897.

- CAMPBELL, FRANK "The India-Catalogue of Biographical Works (chiefly in the English language) Relating to India." (Library Bureau Co.) — —
 ROBINSON, REV. CHAS. H., M.A. "Muhammadanism, has it any Future?" (Gardner, Darton and Co.) 1s. 6d.
 RANJITSINGH, K. S. "The Jubilee Book of Cricket." (William Blackwood and Sons) 6s. 6d.

A writer in the *Times of India* finds great fault with us for holding that it would have been wiser not to use European soldiers for search parties at Poona during the plague. He accuses us, as far as we understand him, of wishing to "brand British soldiers as Bashi-Bazouks," and to "impute to them all the licence of a 'brutal soldiery.'" This is sad stuff. In the article on which it is an attack some pains were taken to express disbelief in the gravest charges that were then being

made against European soldiers. At the same time we held strongly, in common with Anglo-Indians as experienced as Sir Lepel Griffin, that the employment of the European troops was a blunder, no matter how seriously they tried to do their delicate duty. We mention this article in the *Times of India*, with its attempt to "rush" difficult questions and its sneers at native character, as an illustration of an unfortunate change which the militarist policy is producing in India. "Nothing," as Sir Auckland Colvin says, "is so irreconcilable with the honourable spirit of self-reliance to which British rule has given birth among the people of India, and which is by no means incompatible with loyalty, as the tone which is imparted to the administration when the military element in its counsels gains ascendancy. That ascendancy makes itself felt in India as in all other countries, in a less sympathetic attitude towards the people, especially towards the more advanced or ambitious among them." The Anglo-Indian official class speak with positive ferocity now not merely of advanced and ambitious natives, but of those persons who in England attempt to form their own judgments on Indian affairs.—*Manchester Guardian*, (August 24.)

The commendable thoroughness of the precautions at Khana are *pro tanto* a censure on the insufficiency of them at Poona. This is not, as certain foolish Tory organs will have it, to applaud sedition and assassination. It is simply to point out that in all probability the emute did not proceed from the mere unrest of political agitators, but from a sense of grievance which, however ridiculous and inexplicable it may appear to Occidentals, is perfectly natural and intensely real to Orientals. If that be so, then the action of the officials was not so absolutely impeccable as Lord George Hamilton so invincibly insists. What is more, if Indian officials made mistakes (as all persons, even Secretaries of State, do at times), then the very worst course that could be pursued would be to deprive them, by suppressing the organs of native opinion, of the means of learning their errors in time to rectify them.—*Bradford Observer*.

From much reading of the *Times* and other Conservative papers we have learnt that the best place for learning the truth about Indian life is London, and that the worst places in the world for the purpose are Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. From the moment when a member of Parliament, especially if he be a Liberal member, goes to India to see it for himself, he seems to be ticked off as incompetent and discredited. On Monday, for instance, Sir E. Goulley asked the Secretary for India a question in the House of Commons, and yesterday the *Times*, which did not like the tenour of the question, brought against Sir E. Goulley the damning fact that he had visited India. One may learn, it seems, to rule India in a barrister's chambers in London, or in a Lancashire cotton mill, or in a Scotch country house. So long as one remains at those sources of information, one's opinion is received with some respect. But set foot in India, and you are lost. You become a "globe-trotter," and uninformed people at home begin to ask you, with the gravity of a child asking its elders do they know what twice two is, whether you are aware that India contains not one people, but many. We do not know how many times we have seen this recondite piece of learning presented for the confusion of blind Radicals to whom it has appeared that British duties in India do not end with the keeping of wells clean, the planting of trees round the headwaters of rivers, the laying of roads and railways to guard against famine, the dealing out of even justice, and the hundred functions whose efficient discharge renders the subjection of India to this country certainly much more beneficent than any of its previous subjections.—*Manchester Guardian*.

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of Magdalen College, and Secretary of the Appointments Committee in the University of Oxford, acts as Guardian to persons coming to England for Education, and gives information as to the methods available of Education, General and Professional. Address Secretary, INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools), 44, High Street, Oxford, England.—(Adv.)

Printed by A. BONNAR, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 24 and 25, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.]

VOL. VIII., No. 10.
(NEW SERIES.)

OCTOBER, 1897.

[Subscription, Post Free.
SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN.
IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	289	Government by Panic	308
The "Forward" Folly:		The Cost of the "Forward" Folly	310
I.—By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D. ..	295	When is a Frontier not a Frontier?	312
II.—By Professor E. S. Beesly	297	An Official "Non Possumus"	313
III.—By J. Dacosta	298	The Sentence on Mr. Tilak: Opinions of the British Press ..	314
The War beyond the North-West Frontier:		The Deportation of the Nattu Brothers: Epitome of ..	
Designs Maturing for the Future	299	Indian Opinion	316
Opinions of Experts	299	The Debate on the Indian Budget: Some Opinions of the ..	
Some Opinions of the Press:		Press:	
I.—Indian Opinion	301	I.—British Opinion	318
II.—Anglo-Indian Opinion	302	II.—Indian Opinion	319
III.—British Opinion	302	III.—Anglo-Indian Opinion	319
Backwards or Forwards?	305	Payment in Kind	320
The Nightmare of Russian Invasion.. ..	306	Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects..	320

Indiana.

THERE has come to be among our A Discredited Policy. Jingoos at home a stock mode of treating outbreaks of hostilities beyond the North-West frontier of India. While the fighting lasts they say: "this is no time for discussions about policy." When the fighting is over they say: "it is now too late to talk of going back." And so the game has gone on merrily—the indigent taxpayers of India paying the piper while Whitehall and Simla call the tune. The present war, however, partly no doubt because of its unusual magnitude, partly we may hope because of a certain awakening of public opinion, has seen—on paper, at any rate—the defeat of the policy of reticence and rush. During the past few weeks, side by side with the humiliating telegrams from the parts beyond the Indus, readers of newspapers have found caustic, trenchant, and persistent condemnation of the source and cause of all the trouble—namely, the self-defeating "forward" policy. Some attempt is made in the present issue of INDIA to indicate the volume and the weight of this mass of valuable criticism. Experts like Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir Neville Chamberlain, Sir John Adye, Sir James Lyall, Colonel Hanna and Major Raverty have led the way in signed contributions to the *Saturday Review* and the *Times*, while the newspaper press—especially the *Daily News*, the *Daily Chronicle*, the

Manchester Guardian, the *Bradford Observer* and the *Star*—have pressed home day after day the real meaning of the war and the utter collapse of the "forward" school. On the other hand, one looks in vain in any quarter for anything even distantly resembling a plausible defence of the policy of Lord George Hamilton and his friends. The *Times*, when it is not discreetly silent, contradicts itself on successive days. The *Standard*, with a fine air of contempt, abandons discussions of the past as "vain" and entreates the friends of the "forward" policy to contrive some not wholly humiliating compromise for the future.

Where are the Leaders? So far, so good. But a victory on paper is one thing. The actual reversal of a policy is another thing.

Mr. John Morley said somewhere last autumn that throughout the Session the Opposition had been in a majority in everything except numbers. If Lord George Hamilton has not a coherent argument on his side, he has "the largest," and in some respects the most docile, "majority of modern times" at his back. Under ordinary circumstances, when Parliament meets, the wiseacres of the Unionist Party will not ask for reasons, and the Government will be content with votes. It behoves the critics of the useless, costly, and perilous "forward" policy, therefore, to see to it that the circumstances are not ordinary—in other words, that the almost universal opinion of intelligent citizens throughout the country

may have made itself heard and felt. Already the question has been asked in more than one quarter—where are the Liberal leaders? Here, surely, is a matter which deserves their strongest sympathies and their best energies. Jingo writers, having nothing better to say, will say of course—indeed, they are saying now—that Liberals seek to make party capital out of the matter. Cant of that transparent kind deceives nobody. In the Chitral business the policy of Lord Rosebery's Cabinet, which was also the policy of Lord Elgin's proclamation, was hastily and flippantly reversed by Lord George Hamilton and his colleagues. Here, then, is a plain issue even for the mere partisan. But what is really wanted is that the Liberal leaders should rise to the height of a great opportunity and, ranging themselves with the unanimous opinion of educated India, and the almost unanimous opinion of Anglo-Indian "experts," strike a blow at that militarism rampant which, more than any other single cause, is responsible for the present disorders and discontents in British India.

Impatience among Liberals. SIGNS are not wanting to show the impatience of the Liberal rank and file at the apathy of their leaders in view of the present position of affairs in India. Some of the newspapers of September 7 printed a letter in which "a member of the Liberal party," writing to Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., said:—

"The question of the moment is, will not you and your friends call up those (front bench) spirits from the vasty deep of their present dumb inaction? If they will come when you have called, then another effort may be made to save the commonwealth instead of leaving it to the mercy of the now confused and discredited Jingles of the India Office and Simla."

Similarly, on September 14, in a leading article headed "Where are the Liberal leaders?" the *Star* wrote:—

"What are the Liberal leaders thinking about? Here, if anywhere, is a matter which deserves their best efforts and which, rightly placed at this time before the country, would, we are very sure, not only check the policy of grab beyond the Indus but also serve to exhibit, and therefore to discredit, the fatuous Jingoism of our present Government all round. Now, if ever, is the time for the Liberal leaders to turn the 'forward' policy inside out and upside down, to trace its history and origin, to describe its purpose, and to display its terrible consequences—especially its consequences to the Indian taxpayers. Men like Colonel Hanna (in his three admirable volumes), Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir Neville Chamberlain, Sir John Aclay, and Sir James Lyall, have done the work, and done it brilliantly—on paper. But while they are writing the India Office is acting, and unless public opinion in this country makes itself heard and felt, promptly and on a considerable scale, heaven knows what monstrous policy we may be committed to by the Government of India and the Government of Lord Salisbury."

The same wish was expressed with force and

moderation in an admirable letter by Mr. John Addison, printed in the *Speaker* of September 11. "There is some talk," Mr. Addison wrote, "about calling Parliament together in the autumn for the purpose of taking steps to afford India financial aid, but we may take it for certain that this will not be done if the Government can at all avoid it. But whether Parliament is summoned for an autumn session or not, the country will look for some guidance from the Liberal leaders in reference to the very grave state of affairs which has arisen in India."

"It being obvious (Mr. Addison continued) that we have come to a point in the history of our connection with India which demands some searching enquiry into our methods and rule, Liberals have a right to expect that their leaders will show themselves alive to the importance of the question, and do what in them lies to give the country a lead upon it. . . . Our position in India can only be justified by our rule improving the moral and material condition of the people. If, as some say, it is issuing in the progressive impoverishment of the people, then our rule stands condemned. I express no opinion of my own. All I say is that the time is obviously critical, and that statesmen of light and leading who may be called upon to administer our Indian Empire should be prepared to make an avowal of a clear and a decided policy, and to advocate such a thorough and searching enquiry into the principles and methods of Indian administration as would resolve doubts on such points as those above hinted at, and lead to such reforms—especially economic reforms—as might be found necessary."

We await the response of those "statesmen of light and leading."

It is evident, as Reuter said the other day, that the Indian "Government is confronted by a grave crisis "involving heavy expenditure and probably considerable loss of life." But who is to meet this expenditure? As Sir Auckland Colvin asked in a recent article in the *Saturday Review*:—

"Is it the Indian labourer, or the Indian artisan—is it our Indian fellow-subject only—who is to meet this little account? The long foreseen and foretold military bill has fallen due at last, and has been presented with a vengeance. Somehow or other it must be honoured. Serious as the military task now before the Government of India may be, Lord Elgin and his Council will meet with less difficulty, it may be apprehended, in putting down the tribal risings than in finding the resources necessary to defray their cost, without adding materially to the discontent and irritation already too rife among our own Indian fellow-subjects, and having its roots in fiscal pressure and in the growing popular belief of the increasing poverty of India."

The belief has long been general in India that the Imperial Exchequer ought to bear the expense of military aggression beyond the Indus, and this equitable proposal is now beginning to gain ground in the United Kingdom, as the following extracts from the newspaper press may indicate:—

"These operations have been undertaken in defence of

British interests; for extension of British rule; to enlarge the Empire. Yet the over-taxed peasantry of India will have to pay the bill; and if educated natives grumble, they are 'seditions.' Were Parliament's oversight more close, were it compulsory that such military expenditure should come under Parliamentary review, there would be less filibustering on the frontier, and not quite so much provocation of 'sedition.'—*South Wales Daily News* (September 6).

"The whole system of our administration in India, unique and admirable as it is from many points of view, is being very severely tried by the recent succession of plague, famine, sedition, and insurrection; and if to these is to be added a further drain on the impoverished Indian Exchequer in the form of fitting out a big expedition to bring the Amir to his senses, it will be seen that the burdens on our great Eastern dependency is likely to necessitate our drawing upon Imperial resources for the defence and maintenance of the flower of our Empire. Thus the British taxpayer will learn that the Empire about which he has heard so much this year is not altogether inexpensive to maintain. Dominion and greatness are costly luxuries."—*Newcastle Weekly Chronicle* (August 28).

"There is reason to hope and believe that the Government of India is now awakened to the necessity of really subduing once for all these border tribes. No considerations of expenditure should deter it. If India cannot bear the cost, Britain can."—*Scotsman* (September 2).

We quoted last month Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt's proposal for a proportionate Imperial contribution to Indian military expenditure, and, unless Lord Welby's Commission ignores the weight of the evidence given before it, it will make a recommendation in that sense. Meantime, it is interesting to note the opinion expressed by Mr. J. M. Maclean, M.P., in an interview reported in the *Western Mail* of August 25:—

"I believe British rule has conferred immense benefits upon India, but, on the other hand, I have seen with grave anxiety the growing tendency there has been of late years to spend Indian money unprofitably and at a distance from the country where it is raised. The territory in which our troops are now operating does not form properly a part of India at all. It is quite outside India. The whole of the revenue, on the other hand, of the Indian Government is raised from the industrious population labouring in the plains of India itself. The peasant of Bengal, or Bombay, or Madras pays for all these frontier expeditions out of his hard-earned and miserable pittance. It is literally true that at the present moment out of fifty millions of net revenue half comes to England to pay the home charges, while, probably, another third is spent on the Army, which is mainly employed in guarding the frontier. Very little of the Indian revenue is spent, in fact, in India at all."

Mr. Maclean added:—

"Of course, there is always the alternative that the Imperial Government will pay for those frontier wars itself, but I have seen no indications that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is likely to take that responsibility upon himself."

Perhaps not; but Sir Michael Hicks-Beach may have to give way before the necessities of the case.

instructions from Lord George Hamilton, adopted in 1895 in regard to Chitral. Mr. Walter Long, who is President of the Board of Agriculture, and a member of the present Cabinet, said on September 8 last at a Primrose League meeting at Christchurch:—

"We had trouble on the north-western frontier of India, which caused many people anxiety and alarm from fear of a catastrophe. He would not be so rash as to prophesy what might be the result of the difficulties which had arisen there, but we had two securities against any very dangerous development of recent unfortunate episodes. One was that the Government of India was well prepared for any emergency which might arise—well prepared by its own foresight and knowledge of what was possible and probable—and further because we had on the frontier a large and sufficient force, ready at a suitable time and opportunity to teach those rebel tribes who were now endeavouring to repudiate the authority and sovereignty of Great Britain that they were in the wrong, and must bear the punishment."

Lord Elgin's proclamation, which our readers now probably know by heart, promised two years ago that the relief force should be immediately withdrawn from Chitral, and that there should be no permanent occupation of territory or interference with the independence of the tribesmen on the route. Yet these tribesmen, according to a member of Lord Salisbury's Cabinet, are now rebelling against "the authority and sovereignty of Great Britain." Mr. Long has apparently forgotten Lord G. Hamilton's indignant speech of February 17, 1896, in which, replying to Sir W. Wedderburn's allegation that the proclamation had been violated, he said:—

"The proposer of the amendment had accused the Government deliberately of a breach of faith. . . . It was a pure concoction from beginning to end. There was not a word of truth in it. It was not based on one iota of fact. He thought that hon. gentlemen opposite ought to reflect that the Viceroy of India, a high-minded gentleman, was a member of their own party."

Perhaps that rebuke will make Mr. Long feel penitent. But then, again, perhaps it will not. For Mr. Long may observe that in the same speech Lord G. Hamilton said that the Government had occupied Chitral, and made an excellent road from Peshawar to Chitral through the territory of the tribesmen. Indeed, Mr. Long may remark that Lord G. Hamilton in his recent speech on the Indian Budget (August 5) said that we had "extended our sphere of influence over these territories." Does that interfere, or does it not, with the independence of the tribes? Still, Mr. Long's penitence may be encouraged when he finds that on September 2 Sir Mortimer Durand said:—

"One cannot too clearly understand that the frontier tribes who are giving all this trouble are not in British territory, and have not captured any British fort whatever. They occupy a belt of mountain territory lying between India and Afghanistan, and have been for generations independent."

Similarly, Mr. Long may notice that "N" (which sometimes stand for Nathaniel) said in the volu-

It is interesting and instructive to note a certain confusion of tongues among the apologists of the policy which the Government of India, acting under in-

The Candour of
Mr. Long.

minous letter to which the *Times* accorded nearly three columns of large type on September 9:—

"I see it frequently stated that Chitral has been annexed. . . . The State is no more annexed than is Muscat or Zanzibar. The only difference between the present and the former systems is that the British connexion with the country . . . is now permanent instead of fluctuating."

And yet, and yet, the diligent seeker after truth will not even now have found it, pure and undefiled. For in the Queen's Speech delivered to Parliament on February 11, 1896, occurred these words:—

"On the North-West frontier of my Indian Empire the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral have been successful."

On the whole, we fancy that Mr. Long may be disposed to stick to his guns and to say that the *Manchester Guardian* was quite accurate when it wrote:—

"The truth is that Lord George Hamilton tried to disguise, and Mr. Long has blurted out, the way in which the Jingo party in the Ministry regarded the affair of the proclamation. They held that 'reasons of State' excused the breaking of a British promise, and so they broke it, and now they feel that the time has come when they can safely own that they broke it. Mr. Long in a single sentence admits all that Lord George Hamilton made a long speech to conceal."

The tribesmen themselves, we may add, have shown by their conduct that they are not prepared either to split hairs about the differences between "retention," "occupation" and "annexation," or to accept without a struggle "independence" tempered by fortified posts, a military road, a British "sphere of influence," "permanent connexion" and "effective control." That is because the unfortunate tribesmen have not been brought up in the bracing atmosphere of political departments and military diplomacy.

Mr. S. H. SWINNY writes:—Almost alone among English statesmen of the eighteenth century Burke is still quoted as an authority on public affairs. The splendour of his style may account for something of this, as may also the deep philosophic insight and the wide views that were even a hindrance to him in the narrow party conflicts of his own time. But this would not be enough to explain his unique position. The truth is that he has been accepted as the prophet of all that distrust of democracy which has grown up since the failure of the French Revolution cheated the hopes of the Western world. All who cling to the old ways, who doubt the possibilities of violent regeneration, and who shrink from the sacrifices that such a regeneration must entail, find in Burke, with his love of the old, the habitual, and the familiar, and his hatred of present suffering inflicted in the name of general theories and problematic advantages, just that support which their cause lacks, just those broad views necessary to save

it from the taint of narrowness and self-interest. In spite of all that the friends of the Revolution have said, in spite of the efforts to divide his life into two distinct periods of light and darkness, there have been few more consistent careers than his. From the beginning he distrusted the critical spirit that would have everything by reason and nothing by tradition. In his early life he defended the Constitution against the new methods of the king and his friends. In his later life he defended it against the new principles of the French Revolution. But whether he was fighting against the theory of a Patriot King, or the theory of the Rights of Man, he always took up his ground on tradition and precedent, custom and common-sense. And if he was thus blind to the courage, devotion, and high hopes inspired by the Revolution, if he failed to sympathise with these fierce efforts to begin a new reign of justice on earth, is it surprising that he felt nothing but horror for those whose violence had no excuse but the lust for territory, and who destroyed the venerable civilisations of the East to gratify the trader and the buccaneer? Thus there is one point where the modern admirers of his anti-revolutionary polemic part company with Burke; he was no lover of the Empire. He feared for England the over-confidence bred of power, and he foresaw the hatred to which that power would give rise. Above all he had no belief in the forcible introduction of European thought and institutions to undermine those older civilisations that still directed the lives of millions. Nor was this distrust of Empire and imperial ways the idle fancy of callow youth or disappointed age. At his first entry into Parliament he protested against the taxation of the American colonies; in his prime he supported the peace by which those colonies were lost to England for ever; he spent years in the prosecution of Warren Hastings; and finally, in the last scene, amid his embittered attacks on the French Revolution, he recurs to the same theme. This is how he speaks in his "Remarks on the Policy of the Allies with respect to France," written when he was the idol of the Tories:

"I must fairly say I dread our *own* power, and our *own* ambition; I dread our being too much dreaded. . . . Can we say that even at this very hour we are not invidiously aggrandised? We are already in possession of almost all the commerce of the world. Our Empire in India is an awful thing. If we should come to be in a condition not only to have all this ascendancy in commerce, but to be absolutely able, without the least control, to hold the commerce of all other nations totally dependent upon our good pleasure, we may say that we shall not abuse this astonishing and hitherto unheard-of power. But every other nation will think we shall abuse it. It is impossible but that, sooner or later, this state of things must produce a combination against us which may end in our ruin."

"Our Empire in India is an awful thing." Is it

less awful to-day, when a steady drain of millions has been substituted for the occasional pillage of an unscrupulous official, when the manufactures of the country have been ruined, when the people are poorer in peace than they were formerly in war, and when the stirring of Western ideas of liberty mocks the sufferings of the slaves of our Imperial rule? But now there is no Burke to give voice in England to the miseries of India.

Wanted: THE *Times* of September 23 printed the Simultaneous list of the successful candidates in the Examinations. recent examination for appointments in the Civil Service of India as follows:—

Name.	Total Marks.
William Arthur Robinson ..	3,495
Douglas Dewar	3,237
James Wallace Peck	3,163
Alexander Fiddian	3,028
Robert Lindsay Ross	2,995
Charles Cunningham Watson	2,862
Maurice Lyndham Waller ..	2,765
Henry Alford Anthony Cruso	2,719
Frederick Rutson Evans ..	2,654
Joseph Beardsell Crosland ..	2,602
Eustace Alexander Acworth	2,537
Joseph	2,537
David Shearman	2,522
John William Stewart Anderson	2,518
George Herbert Stoker	2,517
Lewis Sidney Steward	2,461
O'Malley	2,461
Charles John Tench Bedford	2,385
Grylls	2,385
Alexander Macgregor	2,385
Roderick Gielkie	2,367
Charles Alexander Innes ..	2,365
Alan Daniel Brown	2,345
Stewart Edmund Pearce	2,336
Philip Longueville Barker ..	2,320
Frederick John Richards ..	2,300
Arthur Mellor	2,302
Henry Lewis Stevenson	2,261
Alexander Phillips Muddiman	2,226
Wilfrid Owen Alcock	2,210
Harold Edward Lawrence ..	2,204
William Gaskell	2,203
Hugh Rosser Bardwell	2,195
Basil Theodore Gibson	2,185
Leslie Maurice Crump	2,182
Charles Frederick Osborne ..	2,145

It would seem that of the 66 successful candidates only 2 are Indians! The fact illustrates the success, such as it is, of the opposition to simultaneous examinations, which the House of Commons has approved but which the Government of India steadily declines to adopt. In theory, Indians are equally eligible with Englishmen for posts in the Indian Civil Service. In fact, all but a very few Indians are barred by the refusal of the authorities to hold the examination in India as well as in London. It goes without saying that none but rich Indians can send their sons to England on the mere chance that they may be successful in the preliminary examination, and it is precisely for this reason that the present iniquitous system is upheld. How ill English performance in this matter squares with English promises, every candid observer sees at a glance; and how disadvantageous the present system is to the public service may be gathered from the heavy falling-off in marks towards the end of the

above list. Nobody supposes that simultaneous examinations would not show a higher average of intellectual attainment among successful candidates.

THE annual summary of the administration of the State of Gondal for 1896-97 is a very satisfactory and encouraging record of steady and useful progress.

There is a healthy absence of high colour in its complexion, and the tone is serious and justifiably hopeful. There is acknowledged room for improvement in the general condition of the population, for the cultivators, the bulk of the people, are stated to be only in "fair" circumstances, while the tradesmen's position is described as "moderate." The State was happily unvisited by the famine, or by the plague, the authorities having taken prompt measures against the invasion of both calamities. The indirect effects of the famine, however, made themselves felt, all the more by reason of the harvests having fallen somewhat below the average. The abnormal rise in grain prices, though lining the pockets of some traders, pinched the poorer classes dependent on wages or limited earnings. The State, however, came forward with timely assistance. It remitted duty on juvari and bajri (staple food) imported from outside Kathiawar; it opened relief works on a liberal regulation scale; and it paid a grain compensation allowance to all State-servants under a certain salary. His Highness at the same time contributed a good sum to the Bombay Relief Fund in recognition of the interdependence of the whole Presidency. Here and there we are told that the figures for last year were incorrectly given. We regard it as a sign of honesty and common sense when such blunders are officially admitted.

Gondal Industries.

THE land of Gondal is nearly all under cultivation, and the culturable waste, not very extensive, will soon be reclaimed if the advance of the past year be maintained. It is reported that the Vighoti, or cash assessment, introduced three years back in place of the Bhagvatai system, continues to work satisfactorily. The rayat is said to be quite satisfied with it, being able to transfer his occupancy right at pleasure, and to pocket the whole value of his improvements. Still, there must be a certain number of grasping men about, and a certain number of improvident rayats. There is good reason, therefore, to watch over the operation of the system. If we understand the table aright, it appears that there has been an increase of transfers of land by sale and mortgage to Khedus both absolutely and relatively to the transfers to non-Khedus. This fact, unless we misunderstand the statement, emphasises the necessity for vigilance to prevent the setting in of a disastrous

current of land ownership. The revenue keeps distinctly on the right side, and the settlement of villages is slowly advancing. More wells have been dug, with great advantage, wells being the only mode of irrigation. The sugar-cane cultivation is steadily and largely decreasing before the superior profitability of cotton, which is the staple produce of the State, and is growing rapidly. Two ginning factories were added last year to the three already in operation, and a sixth is under consideration; and a full-press has been set up at Dhoraji by an enterprising Parsi of Bombay. State encouragement has also been given to the erection of a spinning and weaving mill at Gondal. There seems to be active movement in other manufactures, too, care being taken to foster local aptitudes and endeavours.

Public Works and Justice. THERE is active progress upon a fresh scheme for bringing into Gondal town an ample supply of good drinking water, in supplement, if not supersession, of the existing supply, which is wholly derived from wells and from the river. This enterprise is calculated to run to three lakhs of rupees. It will prove a great boon to the townspeople, especially in the dry weather. The Grasia College building is practically ready for occupation. It is to be run on Western models, and His Highness has appointed to the principalship Mr. S. A. Moor, a distinguished graduate of Cambridge, with special qualifications in science subjects. It is worth noting that the building was wholly designed by, and constructed under the supervision of, the State engineer, Mr. Balabhai Gulabchand. The careful utilisation of local ability is much to be commended. Another wise project is the steady encouragement given to tree-planting, Babul trees being now frequent in the neighbourhood of almost all the villages, as well as in the waste land. These trees are coming more into demand for fuel for the factories. The record of the administration of justice is very satisfactory in all its branches. The health department is also very efficiently managed, as might be expected from the medical training of His Highness the Thakore. Ample evidence of the progress of education is furnished by the fact that the school houses in the principal towns are full and pressing for enlargement. The Thakore may be cordially congratulated on the admirable example he affords to other Native States, and on the credit he does to his country in the eyes of English observers.

Indians in South Africa. THERE has recently been issued to Parliament a paper entitled "Proceedings of a Conference between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Premiers of the Self-governing Colonies at the Colonial Office,

London, June and July, 1897." It consists chiefly of an able speech on questions of Colonial policy by Mr. Chamberlain, in the course of which he deals in a liberal and statesmanlike manner with the vexed question of the treatment of Indians in South Africa. Mr. Chamberlain's remarks are worth quoting at some length, not only because they express with real eloquence the proper Imperial attitude in this matter, but also because they afford clear evidence of the Colonial Secretary's sympathy with this particular Indian grievance. In the first place, speaking of the Alien Immigration Bills, Mr. Chamberlain says with simple directness:—

"I have seen these Bills . . . but there is no one of them, except perhaps the Bill which comes to us from Natal, to which we can look with satisfaction."

Again, after pointing out that communities had a certain right to protect themselves against alien immigration which would "seriously interfere with the legitimate rights of the existing labour population," Mr. Chamberlain reminded his hearers of the traditions of the Empire, which professes to make no distinction in favour of, or against, race or colour, adding these notable words:—

"The United Kingdom owns as its brightest and greatest dependency that enormous Empire of India, with 300,000,000 of subjects, who are loyal to the Crown as you are yourselves, and among them are hundreds and thousands of men who are every whit as civilised as we are ourselves, who are, if that is anything, better born in the sense that they have older traditions and older families, who are men of wealth, men of cultivation, men of distinguished valour, men who have brought whole armies and placed them at the service of the Queen, and have in times of great difficulty and trouble, such for instance as on the occasion of the Indian Mutiny, saved the Empire by their loyalty. I say, you who have seen all this, cannot be willing to put upon those men a slight which I think is absolutely unnecessary for your purpose, and which would be calculated to provoke ill-feeling, discontent, irritation and would be most unpalatable to the feelings not only of Her Majesty the Queen, but of all her people."

Finally, Mr. Chamberlain indicated clearly the only legitimate grounds upon which a State may object to alien immigration.

"What I venture to think you have to deal with is the character of the immigration. It is not because a man is of a different colour from ourselves that he is necessarily an undesirable immigrant, but it is because he is dirty, or he is immoral, or he is a pauper, or he has some other objection which can be defined in an Act of Parliament, and by which the exclusion can be managed with regard to all those whom you really desire to exclude."

These are wise words. You must not generalise against a race, or a colour, or a creed. Each individual immigrant must be judged on his merits. We trust that the Colonial Premiers concerned will ponder well these passages from Mr. Chamberlain's speech and that the Colonial Parliaments will recast their Bills in a form which self-respecting British communities may not be secretly ashamed to pass into law.

THE "FROWARD" FOLLY.

I.—BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

Not on "manifest destiny," but on the Tory party, rests the grave responsibility for the frontier policy that is steadily driving us onward to meet Russia in Central Asia. The Indian Secretary who inaugurated the new departure was Lord Salisbury, but probably he was little more than a pliant agent in the stronger hands of Lord Beaconsfield, who professed to have been "influenced" by "information" from Lord Napier of Magdala. In spite of the steadfast resistance offered by the Government of India over a period of two years, the baneful change was definitively effected with the appointment of Lord Lytton to the viceroyalty. The history of Lord Lytton's government is burnt into living memory by the pitiful treatment of Amír Shere Ali and the miseries and consequences of the second Afghan war. True, the Liberals made strong attempts to overcome the mistakes of their predecessors, and, in Lord Ripon's time especially, we drew back at most points. The root blunder, however, was that we did not boldly and definitively re-confine ourselves to the natural and impregnable line of the Indus Valley. No doubt, it needed an exceptionally powerful statesman to rase the fortifications of Quetta, but, if the right thing is to be done at all, it must be done thoroughly. It stands to the credit of the Liberals that they ordered withdrawal from Chitral and from the whole line of communication through the Swat valley. It seems beyond doubt that the reversal of that order by the present Government is the immediate and sufficient cause for the existing turmoil beyond the frontier. The Tories are responsible for the unfortunate projection of India into the arena of party conflict; and the Liberals will bear no less heavy a responsibility unless they now take up the challenge with all their strength. There is no other question of anything like equal magnitude and urgency before our statesmen to-day.

In these columns I have already been permitted to draw attention to the material difference between the conditions of India to-day and the conditions recognised by Sir Henry Rawlinson in 1874-75 as the favourable basis for his approval, in a very qualified form, of the projects of General Jacob. That difference might well give pause to the promoters and abettors of this "Froward" policy. If that consideration were not sufficient, a comparison of the results during the past twenty years with the experience of the period preceding might well be supposed to be calculated to induce at least hesitation. From the circumstances of the case, it is not to be expected that such a borderland could be kept quiet without occasional brushes with ignorant, headstrong, and venturesome tribesmen, and even without occasional expeditions to mete out specific punishment. But this is a very different matter from a course of perennal warfare that has been calculated by Colonel Hanna—and the calculation is probably as nearly accurate as it can be made on the insufficient accounts available—to have cost India more than 700,000,000 rupees, before the

commencement of the present extensive and expensive operations, the end of which is not yet in sight, or even within probable forecast. The further question remains, Where are we going? At what point do we propose to stop? The answer does not seem to be very difficult, but it would be interesting to know whether the responsible authorities have definitively formulated it in their minds.

The answer is necessarily determined by the operative cause of the frontier advance. That cause is, beyond all question, the activity of Russian conquest in Central Asia. But for this, we should, in all probability, even in spite of the severe strain of military ambitions in the Indian army, still have remained content to protect the Indus frontier in the old way with a handful of Frontier Militia and with conciliatory but firm dealings with the tribesmen. Lord Salisbury, in his despatch of January 22, 1875, initiating the disastrous change of policy, started from the position that "though no immediate danger appears to threaten the interests of Her Majesty in those regions (the frontiers of Persia and Afghanistan), the aspect of affairs is sufficiently grave to inspire solicitude and to suggest the necessity of timely precaution." If any proof were needful to show that Lord Salisbury had Russia in his mind—what other bugbear, indeed, could he possibly have had in his mind?—such proof is ready to hand. Lord Salisbury wrote explicitly to Lord Northbrook on November 19, 1875, that "the question has been clothed with an importance it never possessed before by the recent advances of Russia." On January 28, 1876, the Indian Government replied that "at present we are in possession of no information which leads us to look upon Russian interference in Afghanistan as a probable or near contingency, or to anticipate that the Russian Government will deviate from the policy of non-extension so recently declared." The warning of the Indian Government, however, that the projected action would be "a most impolitic and dangerous movement" was destined to be ignored; on the very day it was penned, Lord Salisbury had drawn up instructions to Lord Lytton containing this clause:—

"7. The maintenance in Afghanistan of a strong and friendly Power has at all times been the object of British policy. The attainment of this object is now to be considered with due reference to the situation created by the recent and rapid advance of the Russian arms in Central Asia towards the northern frontier of British India. Her Majesty's Government cannot view with complete indifference the probable influence of that situation upon the uncertain character of an Oriental chief whose ill-defined dominions are thus brought within a steadily narrowing circle, between the conflicting pressures of two great military Empires, one of which expostulates and remains passive, while the other apologises and continues to move forward."

Later declarations of Lord Beaconsfield in "the same sense, and in the most explicit terms, can readily be quoted. Thus, on December 10, 1878, on Lord Cranbrook's motion for the consent of Parliament to the application of the Indian revenues to the payment of the expedition against the Amír, he said, "things would have gone on, I daresay, as they had gone on for twenty-eight years, had it not been for the sudden appearance of Russia in the immediate vicinity of Afghanistan." It seems im-

possible, then, that anything can be plainer than that the enemy is Russia.

Where are we going, then? The answer is that we are going to meet Russia. We have stretched our hand over Beluchistan, and we dominate the frontier on that side by the enormous post at Quetta. We have roped in the country up to Tal-Ohotiali, which has its advocates as a place of arms even superior to Quetta, and as a point whence it is much easier to march an army upon Kandahar, and a place therefore demanding a railway (estimated in 1891-92 at nearly Rs. 50,000,000) from the plains. We retain hold of Chitral and the Swat road, with the ridiculous object of preventing the approach or interference of Russia from that side; while, by the way, we have thrown Kafiristan on our flank into the hands of the Amír, without right or title on our part or on his. We have also taken into our "sphere of influence" almost the whole of the rest of the frontier tribes, and this sphere of influence is in rapid process of conversion into actual sovereignty. How those seventy or eighty thousand square miles of mountains, and those 200,000 "fanatical" mountaineers, are to be held and managed is a future day-and-night-mare for Sir James Westland. Anyhow, we thus get into full touch with Afghanistan. And what does that mean? It means that it will be impossible for us, do as we may, to keep the frontier without constant offence to the Amír. Of course, we shall be able to take our own way with the Amír, and to punish him if he is so ill-advised as to question the justice of our dealings with him in the settlement of frontier quarrels. But it is certain that every step we take towards his country will arouse his deeper and deeper suspicion of our purposes, and it will be something of the nature of a miracle if he be not at last driven—driven by our demented selves—to look to Russia for a last possibility of preservation. The outcome seems inevitably to be the smashing of the earthen pipkin between the two iron pots, and the division of the Amír's kingdom between England and Russia. Then England and Russia will glare at each other across the Oxus river; and the two countries will be at the mercy of the stupidest or most ambitious officer on this out-of-the-way frontier, and every lying report will turn the minds of both on war. So much for a "scientific" frontier!

Is there any man so sanguine as to suppose that England and Russia will co-operate amicably in the civilisation of Central Asia? Will political rivalry and national antipathies drift harmlessly down the Oxus? The key to this problem is found in the yet deeper reasons for the Russian advance. The unconcealed object of Russian weltering in Central Asia is neither civilisation nor aggression on the Indian Empire, but the maintenance of an effective engine for the counteraction of England in the diplomatic controversies of the Eastern Question in Europe. Lord Beaconsfield, on his side, openly recognised this fact in the speech of December 10, 1878, already referred to.

"What I want to impress on your lordships," he said, "is, that you should not misapprehend the issue on which you have to decide. It is a very grave one. It is not a question of the Khyber Pass merely, and of some small cantonments at

Dakka or at Jellalabad. *It is a question which concerns the character and the influence of England in Europe.*"

The point of view has not shifted since then. The march of events has only tended to render the diplomatic ruse increasingly dangerous to peace. Are we to fight Russia, then, on the banks of the Oxus? That is the plain question that lies before us, and it is useless to mince words over it. Yes or No? Lord Beaconsfield, there is very good reason to believe, did intend to do so in 1878. Does Lord Salisbury remain still of the same opinion? What does Sir James Westland think of the project? And has the English public considered the possibility at all?

Meantime, what do our authorities picture to themselves as the state of things down in India beyond the Indus? The rectification and the maintenance of the frontier will have to be paid for out of the Indian treasury, for any contribution that England may make for the look of the thing—and by reason of the European origin of the expenditure—need hardly be considered. How is this achievement to be accomplished? We know how the treasury has been harassed for years past; we know something of the effects of the famine and the plague; and we know that taxation is admitted even in official quarters to have reached its practical limits, and, in the opinion of dispassionate observers, to have exceeded them. I have already pointed out how the difficulties of the treasury have affected adversely the commerce and the internal development of the country, and touched more or less directly or indirectly the whole population. And while these difficulties have been working out their socially pernicious effects to the verge of political danger, they are to be traced mainly, if not wholly, to the adventurous policy of the Government. Putting the case in another point of view, if it were not for the expenditure necessarily involved in maintaining the "Forward" policy, the financial stringency would no longer be felt. If, then, the finances are dangerously strained now, what is it to be supposed will be their condition when English and Russian officers are eyeing each other across the Oxus? If the finances now prevent the Government from providing an adequate and prompt supply of transport and a safe minimum of regimental officers, what is to be done when we have on our hands the administration of the frontier hills, with a force adequate to cope with Russia quartered on the Oxus, scores of leagues—hundreds of miles—away from our base? Assume the most favourable conditions, and then answer what is to be done? But, on the other hand, assume unfavourable conditions of an easily possible character. Are we quite sure that the pressure of frontier adventure will be lightly borne by the submissive population of India? We have had dire experience of a military mutiny. There is a very different thing that we have not yet experienced, and that is an insurrection of the people. To ignore such a contingency may be patriotic, but, whatever the authorities may think, it is the ostrich-like proceeding of hiding one's head in the sand. The frontier policy is charged with the fate of the Indian Empire.

There is but one means of reducing Russia to

powerlessness, and that is the spectacle of a prosperous, contented, loyal, and therefore unassailable India. The first step towards the attainment of this end must be the pacification of the border and the withdrawal of our forces to the last man within the Indus frontier, resting on Jacobabad and Multan, Peshawar and Rawal Pindi. Then would commence a vast conservation of the finances and an unknown expansion of internal prosperity and contentment. Our power to maintain a "strong, friendly and independent" Afghanistan would be indefinitely increased by the fresh access of strength. There need not be the slightest tremor of discomfort, let Russia do her worst in Central Asia. If the watchmen at the military passes are not alive to their duty, if the desert furnishes footing to any enemy that is negligently allowed to issue on the plain, if further negligence permits such enemy to cross the Indus—then it will be time for us to pack up and come home. But no enemy—Russian or other—can possibly pass the threefold barrier of mountain, desert, and river—or indeed the first—without an English conspiracy of criminal negligence or folly that is beyond rational conception.

II.—BY PROFESSOR E. S. BEESLY.¹

We have had numerous little wars in these regions, but hitherto they have come one at a time. The tribes have been as much at feud with one another as with us. Now for the first time a common fear for their independence seems to have impelled them to something like combined action. We were assured at first that the sudden attack on Colonel Meiklejohn at Malakand had nothing to do with the sudden attack on Mr. Gee at Datoi; and the Indian Government could hardly believe the announcement that the Afridis of the Khyber had summoned us to retire from the valley of the Swat. To account for such unprecedented concert it was imagined that the Amír in the background must be pulling many strings, or even that the connecting link was to be looked for at Constantinople. "We ought to have been more civil to the Sultan," cries the *Times*. "We ought to have bombarded him," retorts the *Spectator*. Any hypothesis is more acceptable than the simple one that our adoption of the "forward" policy all along the frontier has aroused resistance all along the frontier. . . .

To the adoption of this fatal policy several motives have contributed. Soldiers are always eager for opportunities of distinguishing themselves. Sir Lepel Griffin says that if these little wars did not arise naturally we should have to manufacture them in order to keep our army in training. The *Spectator* holds that "an active administrator would not be worth much if his fingers did not itch to be putting an end to the anarchy over the border." No doubt all these motives count for something. But they have existed ever since the Peshawar district became a part of British India, that is to say from 1848; yet the able administrators of an older school knew how to bridle these restless ambitions. How is it

that the advocates of the "forward" policy have been gradually getting the upper hand during the last twenty years?

The explanation is to be looked for in England rather than in India. Anglo-Indian administrators if left to themselves would have continued to keep the soldiers in check. In 1874 the Government of the Empire fell into the hands of Disraeli. During the six years of his reign he devoted himself to stimulating the worst instincts of Englishmen and turning them from ideas of peaceful progress to those of conquest and empire. Certainly he was not alone in this work of corruption. But no single individual had so large a part in it. In 1876 he prevailed upon a reluctant Parliament to give the Queen the foolish title of "Empress of India" and sent out Lord Lytton as Viceroy with instructions to force a quarrel on Afghanistan. The two years' war with that country is now universally acknowledged to have been a disastrous blunder. For some time the "forward" policy was discredited and succeeding Viceroys have laboured, though not very successfully, to convince the Amír that we have abandoned all designs against his independence. But with this exception the bad traditions of Disraeli are again in the ascendant. The interests of India, which lie entirely in peace and economy, are ruthlessly sacrificed to an insane preparation for a duel with Russia. The military party have it all their own way. All along the frontier there are constant encroachments, not indeed on the actual territory of the Amír but on the independent mountain tribes whom he regards as a barrier between his dominions and ours. No information as to his feelings is needed. They can be of only one sort. It is not at all likely that he incited the tribes to this outbreak; but he must wish them success. If this heavily subsidised ally chose to co-operate with us the tribal outbreak would collapse at once. But we do not claim his assistance because he would certainly not give it. We are obliged to be content with his ostensible neutrality. . . .

We need not doubt that the insurgent tribes will be defeated and punished—more or less. Waziris and Orakzais, Afridis and Mohmands will be slaughtered by thousands, dying like brave men in defence of their glens and mountains. Their villages will be burnt and their women and children will perish by starvation. Whether their subjugation will be so complete as to enable the partisans of the "forward" policy to carry out their project of a permanent British occupation of the territory is far from being so certain; not because the Viceroy has just assured the Amír that it shall not be done—for our retention of the road to Chitral has recently shown what a Viceroy's pledges are worth—but because it would mean, if Colonel Hanna is to be believed, "the location of at least 40,000 troops in those miserable and unhealthy regions, every man of that number costing India three times what she has to pay for him within her true limits."

Here lies the insanity of the proceeding. All this risk of military disaster is being run to gain what at the best will be a ruinous loss. When Lord G. Hamilton made his financial statement on August 5 he announced that he would have to borrow

¹ By the courtesy of Professor Beesly we are enabled to print these passages from his article in the October issue of the *Positivists Review*.—ED. "INDIA."

£8,000,000. How much more does he want by this time? The *Spectator* says that "the risk of bankruptcy is as remote as that of a Russian attack." If the writer sincerely believes that, it must be because he counts on the British tax-payer to make good the Indian deficit. It is very likely that some such proposal will be made by the Government before we are many months older.

We are told that when the "forward" policy is held to be necessary by the responsible authorities in India it does not become ignorant persons in England to criticise it. I reply that the "forward" policy was born and bred in England and exported to India. But for the insane jingoism rife among ignorant persons in England the partisans of the "forward" policy in India would have continued to be over-ruled as they were when Lord Lawrence and Lord Northbrook were Viceroy. India is now governed from London. Indian officials who dissent from the views now in favour find they do not get on. The frank expression of opinion from subordinates to superiors, which used to be encouraged and was such a valuable tradition of the Indian Civil Service, no longer prevails. The way to promotion lies in professing agreement with the dominant policy, or at all events in holding your tongue. Of a piece with this is the unwise determination to silence the native press, almost the only means our officials have of observing the tone of native opinion and feeling. This is a system of government which in the long run has never proved successful anywhere. Least of all is it adapted to a country where the rulers are aliens and there is an entire absence of confidence and sympathy between their narrow circle and the vast populations they administer.

Nowadays it is only from retired Anglo-Indians that we can expect to hear a freely expressed judgement. Those who have still much to hope and much to fear from the Government of the day only open their mouths to support the Government of the day. And that Government is no longer to be found at Calcutta, but at Whitehall. The Viceroy has become the mere mouthpiece of an English Ministry placed in office by the readers of English newspapers. Let no Englishman, therefore, who hates militarism shrink from expressing his opinion on Indian questions because he has not an Indian experience. For he will be resisting opinion no better informed, at any rate, than his own, and biassed by a sentiment which at the present day is retrogressive and anti-social. . . .

III.—BY J. DACOSTA.

An article in the *Times* of September 6 under the heading "Indian Affairs" professes to explain the actual situation prevailing beyond the North-West frontier of India. The writer, dividing the disturbed tribal territories into four sections, admits that three of them had been brought within the sphere of our "forward policy," but contends that the fourth section, inhabited by the Orakzais, the Afridis and the Mohmands, had been more or less excluded from it. The difference here referred to amounts merely to the fact that, whereas British forces were employed in attempts to subjugate the other tribes,

subsidies and diplomacy were chiefly used for obtaining the submission of the three tribes above-named. But both methods involved for the tribes concerned the loss of their ancient and fanatically cherished independence, a circumstance which explains their equally persistent resistance which frustrated our designs.

The present situation might perhaps more accurately be described as a war waged by us for the subjugation of the Afghan tribes in pursuance of the "forward policy" of 1876, aiming at the conquest of Afghanistan and the subjection of its ruler to the control of the British Government. Referring to the subsequent period, the writer in the *Times* observes that in Lord Lytton's time the forward policy aimed at our holding Kandahar, Kuram and Jellalabad; but that in 1880-81—that is, when the war entered upon for the execution of that policy had come to a disastrous termination—we withdrew from these positions and fell back upon Jacobabad as our frontier post, thus retiring within the boundaries of our own territories. In 1885, however, the British Cabinet, availing itself of the scare caused by the Penjdeh affair, revived the "forward policy" and employed a series of expeditions in fresh attempts to subjugate the border-tribes of Afghanistan, and to open out roads leading to the heart of that kingdom. And these are still the objects pursued in the present war—a war essentially aggressive on our part, nowise connected with the defence of our frontier and entirely opposed to Lord Roberts's opinion expressed under official responsibility when he was in a position to entertain a correct judgement on the point. He said in his despatch of May, 1880:—

"We have nothing to fear from Afghanistan, and the best thing to do is to leave it as much as possible to itself. It may not be flattering to our *amour propre*; but I feel that I am right when I say that the less the Afghans see of us the less they will dislike us. Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attacking the Afghans to our interests, if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime."

Should the present war enable us to achieve the long attempted subjugation of the border-tribes and to advance our frontier into Afghanistan, the reader should remember that in the opinion of our highest military authorities, India would then lose the impregnable frontier she possessed before the inauguration of the "forward policy," and be subjected at the same time to crushing financial burdens in order to defray the cost of holding the difficult and barren tracts which would be brought within her external frontier.

The issue of the war is still involved in doubt. But recent telegrams show that its cost in treasure and bloodshed is certain to be very great and that the hostile feelings of our tribal neighbours will be much intensified by the strife.

Englishmen should also bear in mind that the revenues of India are being illegally applied to defray military operations carried on beyond her external frontier, and that the war which is being waged has not been justified to the representatives of the nation, whose legitimate control over it was neutralised because the necessary supplies were obtained without the sanction or consent of Parliament.

THE WAR BEYOND THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

FRUITS OF THE "FROWARD" POLICY.

DESIGNS MATURING FOR THE FUTURE.

A BILL FOR THE BRITISH EXCHEQUER.

WHERE ARE THE LIBERAL LEADERS?

EXPERTS HOSTILE TO AGGRESSION.

THE specially retained advocates of the "Froward" policy have been very circumspect in dealing with that "kittle cattle" the British public. None know better than they that the continuous flare of "fanaticism"—that is, despairing patriotism—which began in Waziristan two years since, again in June of this year, presently followed by attacks in force on the Malakand and Chakdara fortified posts, and succeeded by the sealing up of the Khyber and even threats on Peshawar, signified the utter breakdown of their own aggressive operations, more especially since the Kabul transaction of 1893. Therefore the inner circle of experts lay low whilst indiscreet outsiders, such as Lord Roberts and Sir Robert Low, were giving their case away with soldierly frankness. As rising and revolt ran along the whole line even down to the Beluchis, this striking object-lesson was confirmed and punctuated by those of the old-fashioned, stand-fast order whose sage counsel and earnest remonstrances are in part recorded in the following columns. The next stage was when the conflicts of our skilled troops with the half-armed but recklessly brave tribesmen brought out in the telegrams stories of those heroic deeds of endurance and gallantry which are always shown by British and British-led troops, and thrust aside from the public mind the essential questions as to how this fearful struggle had arisen and who had been responsible for its causes and origin. Then the inner circle began to see a fresh chance to hide and confuse these questions. Apart from a few shame-faced assertions deftly inserted in leading articles, the first of the special emissaries, with the modest signature of "N" was given a couple of large type columns in the *Times* wherein to suggest that "the entire question of our frontier administration may come under revision;" and he urged that the public should not "shrink dismayed from the inevitable obligations of Empire." This was followed in the *Standard* by specially subtle but more ominous indications of the secret counsels of the India Office. Then we had a bluff combatant in the *Pall Mall Gazette* trying to make believe that this rising throughout eastern Afghanistan is merely a recrudescence of former "frontier" raids and forays, but also disclosing the great scheme now maturing, described in his specious phrase, "the construction of [fortified] roads [to] introduce the first seeds of civilisation among the mountains." Now to summarise the present position of these "forward" experts and "civilisers" with other people's money: their phrase, quoted above, "our frontier adminis-

tration," is a gross and impudent sophism, with intent to deceive. The schemes now in hand have nothing to do with the "frontier" of British India. The designs now obviously being concocted in secret conclave will be found, when the confiding public shall get ready to bear the full disclosure, to include a gigantic project of absolute and permanent subjugation of tens of thousands of square miles of barren mountain regions far away from the borders of India, the cost of which in millions on millions no statistician can compute, with a perpetuation that no politician can limit of confusion and misery within our Indian Empire, and burdens incalculable on its helpless peoples. But, as these burdens can no longer be borne, the British Treasury and the British taxpayer will have to share them to the tune of several millions annually. Thus, at last, the only Indian "catastrophe" that our public men can really understand is already imminent. So, again, and at the eleventh hour, the question is asked, Where are our independent and masterful statesmen? If they do not wake up this very month, they will be TOO LATE—a legend which has aforetime sounded the knell of empires.

OPINIONS OF EXPERTS.

GENERAL SIR NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.
(*Saturday Review*, September 18.)

The "forward policy" has not been long in coming to judgement. To-day's telegram (September 15) informs the public that 59,000 men, with 90 guns, including Maxims are now engaged in the defence of the frontier. Already the blood of thousands of our self-made enemies stains their mountains beyond our territory, and yet the tribesmen must still shed their blood, and their widows and orphans cry aloud to heaven before British prestige can be satisfied. And what has brought about all this strife and carnage, and the depletion of a well-nigh exhausted treasury? Has it for object the subjugation of the tribesmen who have been free from generation to generation, and who—as freemen—rendered untold service to the English cause in 1857? Or is it towards the realisation of the "scientific frontier" of Disraeli? Or has it for aim the long-cherished object of the most forward of the forward party towards the establishing of British garrisons in Cabul, Ghuznee, Candahar, and Herat?

If 59,000 men and 90 guns are needed to coerce the ill-armed, unorganised tribesmen, it only requires a simple calculation to show the call that will have to be made upon the resources of India before the scientific frontier is nominally established, and the Amir of Cabul driven bag and baggage out of Afghanistan. This is no idle hypothesis, for travellers returning from India are full of the preparations already made at Quetta and Peshawar for eventualities that may any day arise in Afghanistan, or upon the death of Abdur Rahman. Such preparations are better known to the Amir and his subjects than to our own people, and is it possible that such a state of affairs can tend to allay distrust of foster friendship? It is the unceasing encroachments along the whole border and the restless activity of military preparations that has given force to the exhortations of the "mad Mullahs" and made the tribesmen rise in arms.

It is time that the nation took the matter in hand, or it may be dragged by the Government, whether it wishes it or not, into future interminable frontier difficulties. Party tactics must be set aside, the whole root of the

matter must be exposed to everybody's view, and every party in the country must unite to fix upon a frontier and a policy that shall be beyond the power of any Government of the day to set aside, save with the sanction of the constituencies. At present the country is embarked in frontier wars by the Government of India or by the Secretary of State for India at pleasure, be the consequences what they may. One ray of light, and one only, is to be discovered in the darkness that now hangs over the north-west frontier, and that is the hope that passing events will cause our rulers and the nation to realise to the full the folly of being led, under any pretext or by the spell of any popular name, into permanently occupying any posts beyond the confines that Nature has fixed upon as the natural boundary of India.

SIR AUCKLAND COLVIN, K.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

(Interview, September 8.)

After the disturbances have been put down the question of the merits of the frontier policy adopted in recent years will presumably be thoroughly overhauled and examined. That policy practically aimed at establishing British influence, and, if necessary to that end, planting at given points British military posts in various territories beyond our frontier. Its weak point has always seemed to me to be—apart from all questions of right or justification—that in order to be effective it requires a much larger military force than we have at our disposal in India, or than the Indian revenues could pay for, should the army be raised to the figure necessary to provide the further troops required. Any extension of that policy—such as taking up points in the Afridi country, for instance, or undertaking to subjugate and to keep in subjection all or any of the tribes now ranged against us—would prove so costly as practically, in my judgement, to make it quite impossible. Our frontier policy, when it comes to be discussed and examined in all its ultimate possibilities and developments, will have to be re-examined, not only from the point of view of military requirements, but equally from financial and political standpoints. It will have to be asked not only how far it is necessary or possible to establish military dominion in the tribal country, but whether funds are forthcoming to meet the cost, and what will be likely to be the view taken in India of so large a permanent alienation of Indian revenue for requirements in territories far beyond its own borders. . . . Roughly speaking, until 1885 and until the Penjdeh affair, the military authorities of India were looked upon as responsible for the security of India against internal danger only, and the Government of India as a whole were able to judge pretty effectually of any measure that might be proposed to that end, and were able, so to speak, to box their compass. Since 1885, however, the military authorities have occupied themselves mainly with plans and projects for the security of India against attack from Central Asia. This has given them far greater weight in the Council of India. It has enabled them to speak with the greater importance due to their efforts being directed against a more formidable foe, and against what is represented by them, on I know not what authority, as imminent and impending danger. The military authorities in India have, therefore, affirmed, and do affirm from time to time, that this or that position or that range of mountains, or such and such strategic lines, or valleys, or what not, are essential for the defence of the country against a European invader. They are not likely to under-estimate their requirements, and the responsibility lies primarily with them, the Government of India being dragged, as it has seemed to me, almost helplessly at their tail across several mountainous areas and remote valleys, which during the past ten years have been scenes

of constant and successive conflicts. Almost every consideration for the good government of India has been made to yield to the alleged requirements of defence against external attack, and out of these has come about in course of time our present conflict with the tribes whom it is apparently deemed indispensable to overawe in order that they should not assist an invading force if left alone and at liberty. By-and-bye, when the authorities in India have grown more accustomed to the situation created by the presence of Russia in Central Asia, it is to be hoped that some sort of more stable equilibrium may be again established between the several interests pressing on their consideration from various and conflicting quarters.

COLONEL H. B. HANNA.

(Interview, September 19.)

Asked as to the connexion between the occupation of Chitral by the Anglo-Indian forces and the cause of the present rising, Colonel Hanna said: It is the real cause or rather a part of the true cause. That must be sought in the whole frontier policy of the Indian Government since the beginning of the Afghan war. Before that event our relations with the tribes were fairly good, and yearly growing better. Since that event they have been bad, and yearly growing worse; and what is of great importance, where formerly we had to do with one tribe, now we are in contact with a dozen. Without adequate cause, secretly and insidiously, the political and military officers on the frontier have been pushing on from point to point, constructing roads and erecting and garrisoning forts. Quetta was the centre from which this forward movement first began, and it was hidden from the knowledge of the general public by the misleading device of bestowing upon the region thus subject to military occupation—a region entirely inhabited by Pathans—the name of British Baluchistan. If you look at the map you will see how our posts lie scattered all over the Kukar hills and Zhob Valley. But the spread of British authority which could conveniently be reached from Quetta soon failed to satisfy the ambition of the Indian authorities, local and central, and Sir Mortimer Durand was sent to Cabul to obtain the Amir's consent to our bringing all the tribes lying between his dominions and India under British influence. The proposal, though backed up by the offer of a handsome addition to his subsidy, was most reluctantly agreed to by Abdur Rahman, who saw in the confiscation of the independence of his neighbours, the destruction of his own best safeguard against the ulterior projects of the forward school, whose designs upon his kingdom are well known to him. He yielded, however, in the end, and a fresh extension of the forward policy was immediately entered upon. Waziristan, where the present disturbances had their origin, was the first territory to be meddled with. Then followed the occupation of Chitral, carefully brought to pass by political action certain to bring English lives into danger, and so to provide the Indian Government with an excuse for sending up troops to that distant valley. A good many tribes have been directly affected along these two lines of advance, and indirectly many more who saw in our treatment of their neighbours a prophecy of our future dealings with themselves. The fact that we broke our word to the Swatis has had the bad effect of shaking the confidence of the Afridis and others in our good faith, but the occupation of Chitral, and the establishment of posts in tribal territory, would have been sure to provoke revolt even if no promise of withdrawal had been given. The grievances of the tribes are great and well founded. Let me add that in my opinion the only way to remove them and restore peace on the frontier is to withdraw from their territories and to restore their independence.

SIR JAMES B. LYALL, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I.

(Times, September 1.)

The fire was lit by the forward policy in regard to these independent Afghan tribes which was revived in 1887 by the Government of India. I say revived because it was one part of Lord Lytton's general forward policy, which, with some other parts thereof, was laid aside on the lamented death of Cavagnari and the consequent renewal of the Afghan war.

The high promoters of this policy believed that by generous allowances to chiefs and head men, and timely support of their authority by the slight and very occasional use or show of armed force, it would be easy to get into friendly relations with the tribes, and to secure their services and effective control of their country. They very imperfectly apprehended the peculiar temper of these particular tribes, the warmth of their love of their hereditary independence, and the keenness of their dislike to becoming the subjects of a non-Mussulman Power. It is only necessary to read again the letters from General Sir Neville Chamberlain and Sir Charles Brownlow, which you published in April, 1895, (in connexion with the opening of the road through Swat and Bajaur), to see how clearly officers of their great knowledge of these Afghan tribes foresaw what is now happening.

I quite agree that this is no time for volunteering advice to the Government of India, but it seems to me important that the idea should not become ingrained into the public mind that these outbreaks are simply due to anti-English feeling in connexion with events in Turkey, or to mere religious fanaticism. At the present day the preaching of mullahs would not move these people to any general action unless there was a deep personal feeling other than religious to work upon.

As to their supposed love of fighting they now well know our power, and do not rise against us with a light heart.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

I.—INDIAN OPINION.

WHY NOT RETRACE OUR STEPS?

We have a splendid frontier defended by nature. Fortified as it has been in some places it is well-nigh impregnable. Beyond this natural frontier of India are wild tribes which have led an independent life from times immemorial and which resent every attempt on the part of foreigners to civilise them. Beyond these frontier tribes there is the Amir who has a strong and liberty-loving nation at his back—a nation which from the bottom of its heart detests both the Russians and the English and will indeed detest any other nation which it thinks attempts to destroy its independence. A policy of sublime indifference towards these people will inspire greater confidence as to the real attitude of the English in their minds than all attempts to subsidise them with money, arms and ammunition. . . . We should however, go a little further and ask whether it will not be considered most desirable to retrace our steps, leave the frontier tribes to their mutual feuds, and fortifying our natural frontier, remain impregnable to all foes alike European or Asiatic. This policy will bring another good result in its train—it will give more time to the Indian Government to devote itself to its internal work of improving the moral and material condition of the people. Such a result will be welcomed by all classes of Indians alike.—*Indu-Prakash* (August 23).

A SIGNAL COLLAPSE.

There has been a still more deplorable break-down in connection with the foreign policy upon which the Government has so long plumed itself. This policy has been carefully elaborated by a succession of distinguished statesmen. It has involved the expenditure of vast sums of money, and what is more, it has led to the indefinite postponement of all domestic improvements bearing upon the happiness and prosperity of the people. The people have protested against this policy times without number, but they have protested in vain. It

was confidently stated by Lord Lansdowne, one of the high priests of the new departure, that it would put an end to all frontier troubles and to the recurrence of those frontier expeditions which constitute such a heavy drain upon the Indian Exchequer. Events have completely falsified these confident predictions. . . . All these dreams must now be dissipated by the stern logic of facts. The frontier policy has signally collapsed in a manner beyond the speculations of those who had anticipated failure. It must now be recast. The wisdom of Lord Lawrence's Government was never more strikingly illustrated. Will the Government have the courage and the statesmanship to go back? We will wait and see.—*The Bengalee* (August 21).

A CERTAIN FAMILY LIKENESS.

To us it has always been a matter of the utmost scepticism whether implicit credence should be placed in official statements, whether in State despatches or Blue-books, purporting to give the cause or causes which lead to these little wars. Curiously enough, there is always to be observed a certain family likeness about the official narrative, whether the expedition has reference to Chitral or Malakand Pass, Gilgit or Hunza, Waziristan or Black Mountains. There is the same stock story of some wild or murderous chief or sub-chief or a "Mad Mullah" or equally fanatical leader killing a poor British officer—waylaid while in search of science—or molesting a survey party—both harmless occupations, behind which no ulterior or sinister intentions could possibly be concealed. The remarkable circumstance is that these wild tribes or their leaders, puissant or spiritual, should alone be the provoking party while the British officers or their detachments or protégés should always be the injured innocents. If all the stories were collected of the real causes, of course from the Indian Government's point of view, of the various expeditions that have gone forth from Peshawar since the day of the Penjdeh scare it would always be found that the offending parties were the hill-tribes!—*The Champion* (August 22).

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE AMIR.

The ability of the Government to dictate to the Amir by force what he may not be persuaded to do by friendly counsel may be unquestionable, but another Afghan war at this time will be a different thing from that of 1878. Unaided by the Government of India the Afghan army would have remained to-day where it was twenty years ago. But British Indian statesmanship has poured wealth into the Afghan treasury and arms into the Afghan armoury. The Amir is wealthier, has a better organised and better equipped army than any previous ruler of Afghanistan, and is as capable as he is resourceful. His factory is incessantly engaged in manufacturing superior firearms and cannon of heavy and light calibre. For all this he is indebted mainly to the generosity of the Government of India. He is astute and shrewd enough to avoid any open act of unfriendliness towards the Government, and it would be the height of folly to imperil the present relations with him without very sufficient and very distinct proof of hostility on his part.—*Lahore Tribune* (August 21).

A STANDING MENACE TO FINANCIAL PROSPERITY.

It is curious to note that almost every year some such expedition is undertaken; so much so that it has become a standing menace to the financial prosperity of the Indian Government. The Chitral war has cost the taxpayer an integral portion of what would have gone to him in some desirable shape, and now the Malakand expedition closely following it will induce the Government to strain their resources to a large extent. From what we read of the state of affairs across the frontier, we are enabled to infer that the Malakand expedition will turn out to be a most gigantic affair, and will entail serious loss of public money.—*Madras Standard* (August 7).

TAXATION AND STARVATION.

When the annexation of Chitral was resolved upon by the Simla military clique, a strong and well-informed body of public opinion condemned the annexation and pointed out the serious risk that the Government was undertaking. But the selfish clique at Simla misled the Government in India as well as in England by holding out assurances of friendship from the tribes and of an easy and cheap occupation of the tract beyond our frontier. But within two years a rude shock has been given to our original confidence and the tribes, throwing

off their mask, have suddenly risen against the British occupants, thus verifying the prediction that knowing men made two years ago. Government is, no doubt, equal to any emergency; its resources are abundant and its forethought is admirable. It is collecting on the frontier an enormous army, and if not only Afghanistan, but if Russia also were to back Afghanistan and present hostilities to us, we are prepared to give an excellent account of ourselves. But while the war will bring honour and distinction to the army and fresh reputation to our statesmen, what will it bring to the wretched taxpayer? It will bring him fresh burden of taxation and starvation.—*The Hindu* (August 20).

II.—ANGLO-INDIAN OPINION.

HEAVY ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE.

We are not now engaged in any great war such as engrossed attention when the last Famine was drawing to a close. But two expeditions are at this moment beyond the Indian frontier. The largest of these, the force sent to suppress the rising in the Swat Valley, will entail a heavy outlay that will not end with the campaign itself. One of the principal arguments advanced in favour of the retention of Chitral was that the annual outlay upon keeping a garrison there and maintaining the communications would not be large. It was urged that a small force would be sufficient (in addition to bribes, or "payments" as they are called) to keep the tribes in order, and that the road to Chitral had been practically made by the expedition. But the attacks on Malakand and Chakdara have shown the incorrectness of the first contention, and already a large increase in the permanent garrisons is contemplated. The second contention has also been disposed of by Lord George Hamilton's announcement that "the road to Chitral is to be opened," which will, it seems, in some unexplained way "improve the material condition of the tribesmen." All this means heavy permanent addition to the cost of the long lines of communication across the frontier, which, as recent events have shown, render us so liable to attack and to consequent military expeditions.—*Bombay Gazette* (August 13).

AMONG THE PROPHETS.

That the frontier will require careful watching for some time there is no doubt; but it may be surmised that no general and simultaneous rising will take place. Such a thing has never been known before, the usual procedure being for small sections to rise successively when more than one tribe is turbulent, as illustrated by the recent events in the Swat Valley and in the Mohmand country. Concerning the Mohmands there need not be much apprehension. They are not a courageous lot, as they have been proved before, and they are intensely mercenary, not caring to risk much. You have only to put a rupee in your eye and you may look at any Mohmand, man or woman, says a frontier proverb. The greatest danger lies in the possible spread of disaffection to their Southern neighbours, the Afridis, a contingency that our Lahore correspondent refers to to-day. The Afridi is a different kind of Pathan altogether—the most lawless and savage, and at the same time the bravest and most treacherous—a typical frontier Highlander. If he "rises" there will be plenty of work for our troops within the next four weeks. But the contingency is a remote one, we are inclined to believe. The Afridis have been in closer relations with us than any other of the frontier tribes, and their Malik has long ago learned to prefer peace and payments to war and want.—*Madras Mail* (August 14).

A GIGANTIC BLUNDER.

Our officially inspired contemporary, the *Pioneer*, whose grateful task it is to shield administrative blunders of whatever description, hints vaguely at mysterious causes that have yet to be traced in India and Afghanistan; but it is easy to explain the occurrence without going beyond the facts that lie upon the surface. . . . The stationing of small isolated British outposts in inaccessible hills, in the midst of brave and fanatical tribesmen who have never in their previous history submitted to civilised rule, is quite sufficient to account for periodical disturbances; and, so long as the causes that give rise to them are present, short of the impossible operation of disarming the whole frontier, the recurrence of such attempts as those of Maizur and the Malakand is inevitable. The barren hills of Waziristan and Swat will never be able to pay anything appreciable towards the cost of holding them. Datta

Khel and Chitral are both far beyond the natural frontier of India, and a gigantic blunder, to call it by no worse name, was undoubtedly made in including them within the sphere for which the Government of India holds itself responsible. It would be difficult to exaggerate the folly of the whole policy, which entails the maintenance of these dangerous outposts, far removed from our effective base of operations.—*The Statesman* (August 18).

INDEFINITE EXPENDITURE.

It is quite evident that the Government has been so hard hit that it cannot estimate, or shrink from contemplating, the approximate extent of its losses through famine and plague, joined to the damage done by the earthquakes and the indefinite expenditure to which it has been committed by its frontier policy. To that policy Lord George Hamilton has again expressed his determination to adhere, although his statement on Thursday night lacked the confident ring of the declaration he made immediately after taking up office. He now merely "hopes" the Government of India will overcome the predatory habits of the frontier tribesmen by "improving their material condition." If the Government of India shares the hope of the Secretary of State, it is more than we do. If the Government proposes to devote itself to "improving the material condition" of the inhabitants of Swat, while the Mad Mullah is left to improve them from a moral and religious point of view, the complications likely to arise in future will throw any of our past experiences into the shade.—*The Englishman* (August 11).

A RADICAL WAR-CRY!

The fighting in the Malakand was three weeks ago eagerly seized by some of the Radical papers as the text for much unreal preaching upon the wickedness and impolicy of maintaining and securing communications with our political frontier. This looked at the time very much like an attempt to find a substitute for "Home Rule all Round" as a rallying cry for an inert and divided party. . . . Even for Radicals in search of a war-cry something better than the argument that anxiety has been awakened amongst the "other tribes" by this peaceful regimen ought to be provided. It would require more ingenuity than can be found in all Fleet Street to show how the anxiety of the Afridis in and around the Khyber and of the Orakzais on the Samana Range could be excited by keeping open a line of communication which at its nearest point was some days' march from their country. Geography and chronology are alike discouraging to this preposterous theory. It is scarcely good enough even for the not particularly worthy purpose for which it has been devised.—*Times of India* (August 27.)

III.—BRITISH OPINION.

ABSOLUTELY IMMORAL CONQUEST.

The whole question of Indian frontier policy is only too simple. Before they know what was being done, the people of this country were drawn into the beginnings of conquest beyond the Indus. The peoples there had not injured us. We did not on this occasion pretend that we wanted to make Christians of them. They were so poor that there was no hope of their ever buying much cotton. We attacked them simply because certain soldiers said that if we did not attack them Russia would. For the last ten years these attacks have been constantly growing more frequent. The fact that they are attacks is sometimes disguised by elaborate preliminaries which give to the blow when it comes the air of a reprisal. We first send agents to make and unmake chieftains in remote mountain valleys inhabited by Pathan caterans, and in good time our agents are duly set upon, besieged in mud forts, and rescued with a proper flourish of British heroism. The whole performance is cut and dried, and the end of it is never in doubt. We suppose it must be that a punitive expedition against Naboth serves to quiet some consciences that might stick at stealing the vineyard without more ado. For the forward extremists make no secret of their wish that the whole of the Pathan tribes between India, Afghanistan, and Russia should be conquered. It is the most glaring instance of conquest absolutely immoral that can be conceived. In order to relieve ourselves, or certain nervous officials, of fantastic fears of Russian invasion, we deliberately commit over and over again the crime of forcing weak and ill-armed little com-

munities into wars in which, whatever trivial momentary successes they may gain, they have to stand up sooner or later to be killed by thousands, like the Swatis, by our machine guns. What is needed is that people here should rid their minds of the cant which assumes that there is one code of conduct for individuals and another for nations. We have for years been committing beyond the North-West frontier acts strictly corresponding in their moral quality to private acts of robbery with violence. It is no doubt comfortable for slight-minded persons to have this ugly fact disguised by talk about our Imperial mission, but if the Empire is to remain anything better than a greedily and viciously conducted speculation Englishmen must retain enough simplicity and directness of character to lead them straight to the point in such disquisitions as this, where a simple issue of right or wrong presents itself for determination.—*Manchester Guardian* (September 14).

"THE DANGER OF MILITARY COUNSELS."

The civilian governors of the Punjab, who have control of the relations with the frontier tribes, have opposed the policy again and again, but as they have no seat upon the Council they have been unable to make their influence felt. Lord Roberts is primarily to blame, and he forced his views on the Government of India in opposition to the views of men whose knowledge and experience of the frontier tribes are far greater than his. By the occupation of Chitral the military party no doubt hoped to make it impossible to draw back. It lies so far away that if we are to retain it we shall be forced to occupy all the intervening country and bring its inhabitants "within the pale of civilisation." No wonder the tribes have begun to fear for their independence and have been moved to a general resistance to our encroachments. The danger of military counsels in questions of State policy has seldom been more signally illustrated.—*Saturday Review* (September 11).

A "RAD IMITATION OF MACHIAVELLIANISM."

Even Lord George Hamilton admitted two years ago that the expense of occupying the Chitral Valley was a great objection. He remarked in a lucid interval that "no external policy, however bold, and no frontier performances, however heroic, can compensate for the permanent annual deficiency in the Indian exchequer." He made another admission, and a still more significant one. He said that he had not much belief in the strategic value of Chitral, and that the reasons for retaining it were moral rather than military. It appears, then, that there was no military necessity for departing from Lord Elgin's Proclamation, but that the Ministers of the Crown were morally obliged to break their word. We see now what they have gained by their bad imitation of Machiavellianism. If they could have foreseen in 1895 the events of 1897 not even Lord George Hamilton would have consented to the annexation of Chitral. But they ought to have foreseen them. They should have listened to Sir Neville Chamberlain. They should have listened to Sir James Lyall. They should have paid some attention to the views of their predecessors. They should have counted the cost and considered the future. They would not do any of these things, and unfortunately it is not they who bear the punishment of their obstinacy.—*Daily News* (September 2).

WANTED: SEARCHING ENQUIRY.

The first consideration, of course, is to assert the supremacy of our arms; but when that is done there must be a searching enquiry into the whole of our frontier policy. Lord Beaconsfield assured us twenty years ago that he had secured for us "a scientific" instead of a "haphazard frontier," and that our position was "invulnerable" against any and every foe. But now the complaint, even of advocates of the forward school, is that our frontier is so little "scientific," and so entirely "haphazard," that they are unable to trace it on the map. The policy which has been in vogue for some years, and for which Lord Roberts is largely responsible, is to dot military outposts among the tribes beyond our frontier, but within "our sphere of influence"—a vague phrase which has no meaning at all for those tribes, and to which they have never been parties. It simply means that we have agreed with the Amir that he shall regard a certain belt of mountainous territory as outside the sphere of his influence and interference—a concession which we reciprocated by giving him a free hand in Kafiristan—a liberty which he appears to have been utilising by forcing the population to adopt Muhammadanism.—*The Observer* (September 19).

MERELY PLAYING RUSSIA'S GAME.

Whatever route they took, a Russian army of such a size as could seriously threaten India, would be starving every day of its march, since all Russia does not contain the number of baggage animals which would be required to carry food for it along any one of these long and barren routes. Why, then, it may be asked, is Russia making preparations which seem to menace India? If we make such counter-preparations, it is worth Russia's while. We do not suppose Russia loves us. She may not be unwilling to see us following a will of the wind into the glaciers of the Hindu Kush. A forward policy which irritates British India and alienates Pathans and Afghans may not be disagreeable to her. She may conceivably think it worth while to take a few cheap and easy steps of a rather ostentatious kind in order to confirm British Indian policy in a twist so little conducive to British interest. We do not say so positively, for there is no evidence to prove it, but it is perfectly credible that in all their "precautions against Russian aggression" the "forward" party may be merely playing Russia's game.—*Manchester Guardian* (September 3).

LORD GEORGE'S SUBLIME SIMPLICITY.

We have a Secretary of State for India who takes counsel, like Rehoboam, of the young men. Lord George Hamilton believes that India should be governed, as he believes that the British Empire has been maintained, on the principles of the Primrose League. He laughed at the idea that there would be any discontent with British rule in Chitral or the Swat Valley. That, he said, was only the misguided imagination of ignorant Radicals. As a matter of fact, we should be received with open arms, and the only complaint would come from tribes who were not so fortunate as to be annexed. There is something almost sublime in the simplicity of Lord George. But this altitude of mind, which may be wholly admirable in the Grand Master of a Habitation, is rather dangerous in the Secretary of State for India. Phaethon might have passed for a good jog-trot driver if he had kept outside the chariot of the Sun.—*The Speaker* (August 21).

WHERE THE DANGER LIES.

The "forward" policy has had its trial over a fairly extended period; it has failed conspicuously in matters which were the especial pride and boast of its advocates; and it has failed exactly on the lines on which its critics prophesied from the first that it was bound to fail. If we are to derive any profit from these experiences there must be no question of leaving those who have been convicted of disastrous want of foresight to attempt to retrieve the situation by plunging more desperately when so much has already been lost; and unless those who hold Sir Auckland Colvin's opinions are equally frank and insistent in the expression of them while there is yet time there is no small risk that the terms of ultimate settlement will open the way to graver mischiefs than any we have yet encountered. The danger lies in the committal of the settlement of the whole business—involving, as it does, questions of the utmost political and financial moment—to the charge of the Indian military authorities, who, as Sir Auckland Colvin points out, have exercised a predominant influence in the Viceroy's Council since 1886.—*Bradford Observer* (September 9).

"WE MUST HARK BACK."

The official apologists of the policy which is immediately responsible for our present humiliation—to say nothing of the appalling waste of India's taxes—beyond the North-West frontier, are beginning to pluck up a little defiant courage. Utterly worsted in the discussion about the "forward" policy, they now describe that discussion as "vain," and bid us look to the future, regarding the "forward" policy as the unassailable basis of settlement. A more audacious begging of the question it would be difficult to conceive. What matters is not continuity of policy, but doing the right thing. But if the "forward" policy is to come by its due, all who distrust militarism, and all who have a care for the future of British rule in India, will have to bestir themselves. The *Standard*, which is supposed to know something of the mind of the Cabinet, says to-day:—"The real question to be faced has reference, not to the history of the various compromises which have come into force in the past, but to the imperative necessity of organising some system of control which shall ensure the maintenance of peace in a borderland irrevocably included within the British sphere of influence." The recent

here is on the word "irrevocably." The errors of the past are not irrevocable. The borderland which has been so ill included must be abandoned. No other policy can be satisfactory. We must hark back to the same principles of Lord Lawrence which are stoutly upheld to-day by men like Sir Donald Stewart, Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir Neville Chamberlain, Sir James Lyall, Colonel Hanna, and, indeed, every expert save Lord Roberts, who can be contradicted out of his own mouth.—*The Star* (September 22).

"A HORRID NUISANCE."

It is all a horrid nuisance, no doubt. Every incident of the kind is an interruption to real work, just as a European war is an interruption to progress. The Indian Government needs every moment of time and every rupee of revenue that it can use, for its daily work of administration, for physical improvements which have hardly begun—just listen to the accounts of men who have seen the Plague in Bombay—and for that solidification of the Empire on bases other than cantonments which has not begun at all. Not one Indian fighting race has joined us yet, nor is there one which can be relied on to perish before the Empress's throne is overturned. There is an infinity of work to do, and whenever there is a campaign it all stops, if only for reasons of expenditure and all eyes, Indian eyes as well as English eyes, turn towards the scene of action.—*The Spectator* (August 21).

The military influence has been predominant in India, and at the India Office in England the opinions and advice of the wisest councillors have been contemptuously disregarded. "What can you expect," asks one of our correspondents, "when the opinion of every one of experience is set aside in favour of that of a self-sufficient and ignorant prig like Mr. George Curzon?" Our true policy towards the frontier tribes should be one of conciliation and friendliness. To annex their territory and to make military roads is to weaken, not strengthen, the frontier.—*Saturday Review* (August 21).

Instead of adhering to the terms of the Queen's proclamation, the very first act of the present Government was to intimate that Chitral would be permanently occupied. With what face can we charge the tribesmen with treachery when our own position there is the result of a breach of faith? With what honesty can we pledge British honour when the Queen's word is violated in this fashion? Yet, singularly enough, the whole justification of the "forward policy," as expounded by Lord Roberts, is the cultivation of cordial relations with the frontier tribes.—*Eastern Morning News* (August 23).

We are afraid there is a good deal of truth, after all, in General Chamberlain's contention in the *Saturday Review* that outposts have been pushed forward in the border country with too free a hand, and permanent garrisons established on lands belonging to the tribesmen where we cannot readily reach or reinforce them in emergency.—*Birmingham Daily Post* (August 31).

It is satisfactory that none of the Anglo-Indians who have yet expressed their views on the subject consider the situation a very serious one, or doubt the power of the Indian Government to deal thoroughly and effectively with the menaces of hostile tribesmen. When these are settled with some modification of frontier policy may be necessary. Whatever new arrangements are made, clear and definite terms, which the tribes cannot mistake, will need to be laid down. It would be well to put an end once for all, by effective measures, to the frequent need of punitive expeditions, which are no less disastrous to the finances and to the material and social status of India than they are irritating and discouraging to the people of this country.—*Sunday Times* (September 5).

The curse of this forward policy is that by it we get no "forwarder." Protectionists, in the vain pursuit of their phantom, are always asking for just one more turn of the screw, which alone is wanted for the complete success of their policy. Just another 20 per cent., *ad valorem*, and the country will be prosperous. In the same way, these military men always find there is just another river or mountain chain necessary to make the frontier perfectly secure. Lord Roberts now declares that the frontier will not be secure until it is joined to Cabul and Candahar by a line of railway! How much longer is this tomfoolery to be dignified with the name of statesmanship?—"A. H." in the *Leeds Mercury* (August 28).

The "forward policy" has come to grief, and now all the talk is about sending an overwhelming force to break the power of the Afridis. Of course, we shall defeat them in the end, but we shall have made implacable enemies where we might have kept useful friends.—*North British Daily Mail* (August 30).

When Lord Salisbury and his colleagues reversed the decision of their predecessors, Lord Rosebery warned them solemnly of the inevitable consequences of the policy they elected to adopt, and predicted grave troubles on the frontier as a result of their breach of faith with the tribesmen. Mr. Akers-Douglas's desire for information regarding "the causes that have led to the present troubles" comes, therefore, rather late in the day. We are now seeing the effects of a cause for which he must be held partly responsible.—*Leeds Mercury* (August 31).

In view of the facts it may well be doubted whether this forward movement, which has increased the burthens on the unfortunate Indian people by thirty-five per cent. in a dozen years, has not really weakened the defensive power of the British in India against a northern attack instead of strengthening it.—*Freeman's Journal* (August 28).

If our Government is alive to its duty, as soon as it has punished the malcontents outside the proper limits of British India, it will leave those malcontents to their own devices, and will concentrate its energies in making British India itself the prosperous and profitable possession that under firm and just rule it cannot fail to be.—*The Referee* (August 29).

Each successive telegram of bloodshed and expenditure provokes an ever-increasing irritation when we remember that all this ghastly and costly business was due to the headstrong blunder of Lord George Hamilton and Lord Roberts, who, in defiance of all that was best in Anglo-Indian opinion, persisted in abandoning the old frontier and establishing the outposts of British authority far beyond the line where it could be effectively and economically defended. The duty of withdrawal within our own frontier, after the relief of Chitral, was almost the only important question upon which the late Liberal Cabinet was absolutely unanimous. But in face of every protest, Lord George Hamilton and Lord Roberts persisted in drawing this advance line across the hills, thereby threatening the independence of the most fanatical independent tribes of Highland men to be found outside Montenegro. The Indian telegrams of last month have indeed supplied ample vindication of the sound statesmanship of the Liberal Administration on this question.—*Review of Reviews* (September).

The wild and independent mountain tribes of the frontier might have been made our permanent friends, and their territory would have constituted an invaluable buffer against invasion. We are now converting them all into everlasting foes. This policy necessitates the looking up of regular troops in worthless districts, who in war-time will be needed elsewhere, while it establishes permanent bitterness amongst the hill tribes.—*Christian Commonwealth* (September 2).

These frontiers have cost us millions of money to conquer, they are not necessary for the defence of India, and they are inhabited by uncivilised tribes who would oppose any Power intent on effecting their subjugation. We went into their country to build forts, hold passes, command roads, and to be better able to resist a Russian advance on India. At least, that was the plausible argument that was considered good enough for civilians. Looking back at the policy, it does not seem very successful. It seems just now to be as calamitous as it can be.—*Leicester Daily Post* (August 20).

One point will certainly be raised in Parliament, and should be discussed, namely, whether it is wise to occupy distant posts like Chitral at so great a distance from the frontier line. If India is to be one day attacked from the north, would not one of our chief defences be found in the rugged independence of the warlike tribes through which our assailant would have to pass before he could strike the first blow?—*East Anglian Daily Times* (August 23).

We wish all our readers could read the September issue of *INRIA*, which contains a large amount of information with respect to the nature and results of the "forward policy" in India, which has once more involved us in much unnecessary bloodshed and peril.—*Methodist Times* (September 9).

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1897.

BACKWARDS OR FORWARDS?

THE Calcutta *Englishman*, the organ of the Indian Civil Service, wrote in the middle of August last that the frontier policy had so far answered excellently as a stimulant for minds jaded with the monotonous round of Simla festivities. The *Englishman* sympathised with "this craving after warlike excitement." But it could not put the question of cost altogether aside. "Nor," it added, "is this the most serious question. It is of even greater importance that we should know when and how all this is to end." That is the question which is being steadily forced to the front at home also, in spite of the manifest and easily understood reluctance of the champions of a discredited policy to come to close quarters with experts like Sir Neville Chamberlain and Sir Auckland Colvin. Argument has never been the strong point of the "forward" school. They are content to act while others write, and to commit the Government of India to a ruinous policy of immoral and perilous aggression while the public at home is asleep. If anybody has assumed that the present war beyond the Indian frontier must turn the "forward" school from the error of their ways, the assumption is egregiously mistaken. Nothing save precise orders from home can terminate the "forward" policy, and, in spite of the terrible object-lesson of the past few months, those orders will

not be given unless public opinion at home makes itself irresistibly heard. If the *Times* and the *Standard*, and the anonymous correspondents whom they delight to honour, may be taken to represent the views of the India Office and of the military clique that predominates in the Government of India, nothing is more certain than that the close of the present operations will be made the starting-point, not for a return to the sane policy of Lawrence and the wisest of his successors, but for a development of the "forward" policy on an unprecedented scale of ambition. That is the real danger which it behoves every Englishman who has not lost his head to do his best to avert. The apologists of the "forward" school contradict themselves and each other frequently, vigorously, and with complacency. Their predictions have been falsified with indolent completeness, and with every circumstance of humiliation. But nothing daunts them. In one point at least they argue and persist—namely, in declaring that whatever else may have set the parts beyond the North-West frontier ablaze, the "forward" policy at any rate has contributed nothing to the conflagration. The fault lies with the Sultan; or with Mr. Gladstone for denouncing the Sultan; or with Lord Salisbury for not overthrowing the Sultan; or with the Amir of Afghanistan; or with the bellicose instincts of the tribesmen; or with excessive education in India; or with the vernacular press; or with the famine and the plague;—the fault lies with these influences, or with any combination or permutation of them according to the taste of the individual writer, but it emphatically does not lie with the "forward" policy and its friends. In short, as the *Saturday Review* says, if we are to believe these wiseacres there is only one cause which has not influenced the tribes, and that is the recent forcible occupation of points within their territory by British troops.

That is obviously not an attitude of repentance. The *Times*, with an air of conclusiveness, says that some of the critics of the "forward" policy are mere Radicals. The *Standard* goes further and supplies Lord George Hamilton with a line of excuse for the past and of policy for the future. On September 16 the *Standard*, which is sometimes the spokesman of a Conservative Government, wrote:—

"The task of enforcing our authority over the border has only just begun. The real origin of recent troubles must be sought in the incompleteness with which even the foundations of firmer rule have been established. They are due, not to the inherent defects of the 'forward' policy but to the impossibility of finishing in a few years a task which it will take a generation and more to accomplish. . . . A more permanent system, and one more in consonance with the principles of the 'forward' policy, has yet to be adopted; and its application, if only financial considerations permit, will in all probability be the most notable outcome of the present uprising."

The same journal added on September 22:—

"It must be clearly recognised that the objects to be attained include something more than the blowing up of towers, the dispersal of hostile gatherings, the destruction of villages, and other measures calculated to make the tribesmen who attacked our outposts and raided over our border perceive the impropriety of their conduct. Wider and more permanent results must be aimed at. . . . The real question to be faced has reference, not to the history of the various compromises which have come into force in the past, but to the imperative necessity of organising some system of control which

shall ensure the maintenance of peace in a borderland irrevocably included within the British sphere of influence."

Similarly one finds the *Morning Post* and the *Scotman* arguing that the "forward" policy has hitherto been "starved for the sake of economy," and that "we limit expenditure to the lowest possible amount, and try to show that the cost of the operations is "but a trifle, and is never likely to be serious." Perversity and blindness of this kind may be amazing, but it is what the opponents of the "forward" policy have to face. The "trifles" and the "economies" which are so contemptuously regarded, and which, if the Jingoës have their way, will now be abandoned, have cost the indigent taxpayers of India an ascertainable sum of something more than seven hundred millions of rupees. What is to be the cost of the more ambitious policy to which we are now vaguely invited? What is the precise nature of the policy proposed? And who is to pay the bill? Our Jingoës do not attempt to answer these questions. One looks in vain for any argued defence of the "forward" policy. What one finds is merely reckless prediction, a reckless lust of aggression, a reckless and unceasing demand that the Government of India should go on and on, nobody knows where, and squander millions upon millions, nobody knows how many, to be provided or extorted nobody knows whence. The folly and the wickedness of the thing are unspeakable. Clearly its advocates rely merely upon public indifference, and the misleading catchwords "scientific" frontier and "forward" policy.

When the apologists of the "forward" policy have deviated into argument, they have produced results the reverse of encouraging. The writer of "Indian Affairs," for example, said in the *Times* of September 6, that "there should be no disguising of the truth that the tribal risings amount to an attack on our present system of frontier policy." But he straightway proceeded to argue in effect that the risings were not serious where the "forward" policy had been, and were serious where it had not been, applied. The value of the apology may be estimated by a single test. It was necessary to the argument to assume that the Orakzais were "more or less excluded from" the sphere of the "forward" policy—the Orakzais of whom Mr. Thorburn in his "Asiatic Neighbours" wrote that by the application of the forward policy to their territory, "a perpetual grievance is created which will embitter the Orakzais against us for all time." Hardly less unfortunate was the mysterious and dogmatic "N" who, in a long letter in the *Times* of September 9, threw over the writer of "Indian Affairs" and other inventors of special pleadings in order to announce that to those who, like himself, knew India, the risings beyond the border were nothing surprising. By way of shielding the "forward" policy from the attacks of ignorant and illogical Radicals "N" asked: "Why should the Afridis now rebel because "for two years there has been applied to the people "of Swat, Dir, and Chitral precisely the same "system of tribal levies, military road, and Indian "subsidies which they have themselves acquiesced "in for 16 years?" Half-a-column later he forgot this plea, and asked anew:—"Why should the

"Afridis have risen at all when the forward policy "has admittedly never been applied to them?" In other words, ignorant and illogical Radicals are assured (1) that 16 years' personal experience has made the Afridis love the "forward" policy, and (2) that they have never had experience of it. This is the sort of sapience the "forward" policy vouchsafes to her children. And it is, of course, a mere detail that "N" and the *Times*, in arguing that these troubles beyond the border are things to be expected, throw over Lord George Hamilton and his confident prediction that the occupation of Chitral would put an end to outbreaks of fanaticism and terrorism. That prediction has gone the way of Mr. G. N. Ourzou's no less emphatic declaration that, thanks to the wise arrangements between the Government of India and the Khyber levies, "in case of the outbreak of war we might rely with "certainty upon our subsidised allies to co-operate "with us either for the purpose of guarding our "own advance or of resisting the descent of a "hostile force." Never were prophets more ludicrously disappointed than the soothsayers of the "forward" school. Yet on the strength of their failures—the millions they have squandered, the wars they have provoked, the lives they have sacrificed, and the discontent they have spread in India itself—they now have the superlative effrontery to invite the public at home to entrust them with still larger sums for still more ambitious designs of the same type. Indeed, so utterly do they despise their audiences that Lord Wolseley permits himself to say: "We fight [with the Afridis] in the interests "of peace because we love peace." It is for the public at home to say whether ambitious soldiers in India shall go forward to inevitable war with Afghanistan at the expense of the British Exchequer—India having now sunk to a point of penury at which exploitation ceases to be possible—or, humbled by the appalling results of an immoral, useless, and actively perilous policy, shall go back to the sane statesmanship of Lawrence, and, ceasing to play Russia's game, shall ensure safety by "holding our "ground and doing our duty."

THE NIGHTMARE OF RUSSIAN INVASION.

THE fear of a Russian invasion of India by the North-West frontier has drawn the British Government into a course of action that illustrates painfully the sagacious Swedish Chancellor's remark: "Behold, my son, with how little wisdom the world is governed." The disturbing action of Russia in Central Asia is well understood to be promoted by way of leverage against Great Britain in the questions of Eastern Europe. No doubt there are some fanatics in Russia who press for active operations directly against our tenure of India, but it is substantially certain that no such ideas find countenance with the influential authorities. And for a very good reason: they recognise that the undertaking is hopelessly beyond their power. Skobelev, in the days of his inexperience of Central Asia, talked exuberantly about organising "masses of Asiatic cavalry, and "hurling them into India under the banner of blood

"and pillage, as a vanguard as it were, thus reviving the times of Tamerlane." This was all very fine and large—on paper. But before you make your omelette, you have to get your eggs. The "masses of Asiatic cavalry" have to be reduced from the sphere of imagination into the actualities of war; and when Skobelev came to business he found that, though he stamped the sand hard, the men and horses did not spring up. "Three very modest squadrons of irregulars, aggregating 310 rank and file," we are told, "is all the Turkoman cavalry that Russia possesses." Yet this ignorant bombast of Skobelev served to stir a wave of excitement in minds that should have known better. In 1882, after sufficient experience of Central Asia, Skobelev did not hesitate to recall his earlier utterance, and to declare that he did not understand what our military men meant by talking of a Russian invasion of India. "I should not like to be the commander of such an expedition," he said. And if Skobelev adopted that attitude, what egregious presumption of folly may not be attributed to any other Russian general who may venture to address himself to the task? Grodekoff, who enjoyed the illuminating experience of collecting supplies for the Akhal Tekke campaign, was no less emphatic than his chief. He asserted frankly that it would be impossible for Russia to march a competent army into India. To his mind, also, a Russian invasion of India is an impossibility. If it be argued that these officers were merely trying to throw us off the scent, then the question must be considered in view of the definite facts that were, or might have been, present to their minds. Such facts are open to the study of anyone that cares to look at them; and they are of such a character that there is no room for expert military opinion to overbear the judgement of the plain citizen. As a matter of fact, however, the vast weight of military expert opinion coincides with the lay opinion, and Lord Roberts is the sole authority of distinction who gives his name—and that by an afterthought—to the support of the "Forward" policy.

In the first place, consider the nature of the ground. It is not a smiling English or Indian plain that a Russian army would have to cross. It is a howling wilderness of sand and rocks, shut in at last by an impassable range of mountains, succeeded first by an impassable desert, and next by an impassable river. Colonel Hanna has set forth all this in absolutely convincing array. The Russian base must be Tiflis, some 2,000 miles distant from the Indus! But even the Caucasus is poorly furnished with resources as compared with India, and the base would have to be fed mainly from more distant parts of the empire. From Tiflis to Baku, on the western coast of the Caspian, is 341 miles, over a railway badly built for the heavy traffic to be presumed, all but totally unfurnished with the minimum of necessary transport, and liable to have its bridges swept away by floods, as in the winter before last. Baku stands in a desert, and the slight rainfall has to be supplemented by cargoes of drinking-water from the Volga. The Caspian takes 24 to 30 hours to cross, to say nothing of the difficulties of disembarkation on a shallow, shelving shore; and time is

of the essence of the problem. On the eastern side of the Caspian any considerable army would die of thirst, and this demands the establishment of condensing machinery on a very large scale. Put your army on the Transcaspiian railway at Usan Ada or Krasnovodsk, and you will soon find that this line is badly constructed and badly worked. The route to Samarcand is the route that "offered the greatest promise of subsistence by the way." Yet the view on the first 144 miles—and the view probably for the most part takes in all the cultivated or cultivable space—"chills the traveller with its lifeless monotony." The next stretch of 240 miles runs through sand, broken only by the slight oases of Kizil Avat, Akhal Tepe and Atak, which have enough to do to supply the simple wants of the local populations. Another hundred miles of desert take us to Merv. Assuming that a dash is made straight upon Herat, or that the desert and the Oxus are braved in a descent upon Balkh, the invader is at once involved with the Afghans. Let him even hold Herat—that ridiculously belauded "mass of mud hovels;" it could only be regarded as a temporary refuge; it cannot possibly serve as a point of concentration, and starvation would at once compel resumption of the march. Now the passes of the frontier have to be negotiated. Taking the whole range of some 700 miles from Chitral westwards, there may be several hundreds of passes, but the military passes are practically three—the Khyber, the Kuram, and the Bolan. These alone need serious consideration, in spite of all the nonsense that has been talked about the Boroghil and Chitral. And, given the meanest modicum of English sense and energy, can it be imagined for a moment that any army—Russian or other—is capable of forcing its way through in face of English guns and English steel? The thing is ridiculous. Yet, supposing it did, how is it to cross the desert? And how could it, by any practicable device, bridge the Indus in the teeth of an enemy that had not absolutely gone to sleep? The supposition is nothing short of idiotic.

But where is this Russian army to come from? "To invade India," said Skobelev, "we should need 150,000 troops—60,000 to enter India with, and 90,000 to guard the communications." Grodekoff's estimate was double—300,000 men; and if Skobelev imagined he could enter India with 60,000 men in face of the British defence, he was certainly in a most sanguine mood. But the Caucasus army is estimated only at 200,000, with 388 guns. "70,000 of the troops belong to the Regular Army, 50,000 to the Reserve, 30,000 are Georgian and Imeritian Irregulars, and 50,000 Cossacks drawn from settlements north of the Caucasus." The Regulars are absorbed in garrisoning Transcaspiia, and in holding the fortified towns on the Turkish and Persian frontiers. The Reservists are little better than militia, and the rest are known to be in a poor state of efficiency. Russia could not bear the strain of providing anything like the necessary force, to say nothing of supplying the frightful waste continuously accruing. How the force, if provided, could be forwarded over the wretched single line of railway, is a problem that the Russian War Department may

be wished all joy of. They will remember their experience at Tchikishliar in the expedition against the Turkomans of Dengeel Tepe; and we, on our side, can guess the results from the recent congestion on the North-Western Railway. And where is the transport to come from? For the subjugation of Akhal, the Russians, with only 5,000 troops, required 20,000 camels, which all died. And as Skobelev put it, "if 5,000 men need 20,000 camels, what would 150,000 need, and where could we get the transport?" We hear complaints of the difficulty of our own transport in the Bajaur territory, but a few miles from our base. We found almost the whole of our transport broken to pieces in the comparatively small expeditions of 1889-95. Such experiences may well enable us to look upon Russian aggression with quiet unconcern. Besides, as Colonel Hanna points out, the elements of time and of wear and tear are of the most fundamental importance. Suppose the railway break down, not with congestion, but by obliteration of a stretch of it through sand or snow storm, or an irruption of floods. Suppose a flank attack from the side of Persia, or raids at some point or at fifty points by Turkoman tribesmen. Consider where the enormous mass of men and animals is to get water on the march. These are but the merest surface considerations. Yet what conclusion can they possibly point but the utter and hopeless inability of Russia to hurt us in India, if we will only keep quiet within our pre-Lytton frontier? We have said nothing of British preparations for the reception of the Russian visitors. It may, indeed, be questioned whether any special preparations would be necessary. The larger probability is that the Russian army would be reduced to the merest absurd handful before it reached the passes of the frontier, if indeed it were not overwhelmed in the sands of Central Asia, or cut to pieces by the Turkomans and the Afghans. It is sufficiently pitiful, therefore, that India should be put to such vast trouble and expenditure for defence against such a nightmare of military faddists.

GOVERNMENT BY PANIC.

THE sentence of eighteen months' rigorous imprisonment passed upon Mr. Tilak at Bombay on September 14 for seditious incitement in his journal, the *Kesari* (that is, "the lion"), and, still more, Mr. Justice Strachey's amazing interpretation of the law, have, as will be seen from the newspaper extracts printed on another page, provoked much hostile criticism in the United Kingdom. The remarks of the *Standard* are specially noteworthy. The *Standard* is commonly regarded as the official organ of the Tory party in London. Moreover, the writer of the article, despite his adverse criticisms, took some pains to argue himself into the belief that justice had been done. Reluctant condemnation from such a quarter carries a weight which is not easily exaggerated. The *Times*, observing justly that in the absence of a full report, "any detailed comment upon the course of the proceedings would be premature and unwarranted," hastened to add that the verdict was

sensible and the sentence neither harsh nor vindictive. That is the sort of apology which refutes itself. Observers who are not dominated by partisanship may well await the full report before they pass judgement upon the case as a whole. But there are obviously some features of it which call for immediate notice. Chief among these is Mr. Strachey's summing-up. Section 124 A of the Indian Penal Code, under which Mr. Tilak was brought to trial, is directed against attempts "to excite feelings of disaffection to the Government." The term "feelings of disaffection" being dangerously vague, an "explanation" was added which laid down that "such a disapprobation of the measures of the Government as is compatible with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government is not disaffection." The chief duty, therefore, which devolves upon an Anglo-Indian judge in a prosecution under this section is to explain clearly and fairly to the jury the difference between disaffection and legitimate disapprobation. That is precisely what Mr. Strachey, unless he has been very stupidly reported, failed to do. On the contrary, as most of his critics at home have remarked, he left no choice to the jury, but reduced the "explanation" to a dead letter.

"Disaffection, (he said), meant hostility or ill-will of any sort towards the Government, feelings of ill-will—great or small, intense or mild; and any attempt to excite such feelings brought the offender within the section. It was not action but feeling that was the test. . . . Comments upon a measure of the Government, if they excited hatred, must also come within the meaning of the section . . . disaffection meant want of affection. . . . Disapprobation unless kept within certain bounds became disaffection . . . and the measures of the Government must be taken to mean everything they did or omitted to do."

After such a summing-up as this—a mere travesty of justice—the jury had to choose between dissenting from the judge's law and finding the accused guilty. The effect of Mr. Strachey's indiscretion is therefore to take away from the sentence upon Mr. Tilak any moral value which it might otherwise have had. Sir James Stephen, who was responsible for Section 124A of the Penal Code, explained its meaning in these simple words: "You may say 'what you like about any Government measure, you may publish or speak what you please, so long as you say or write what is consistent with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government.'" Under that interpretation of the law, helpful criticism of Government measures was possible. Under Mr. Strachey's interpretation, it becomes impossible. No journalist may write anything calculated to excite even the smallest and mildest feelings of ill-will towards the Government. He may not say, for example, that the new Cantonments legislation, which has very properly excited a storm of indignation in India, is unworthy of a civilised Government. The journalist must be affectionate towards the Government, or he is seditious.

A Reuter's telegram of September 24 stated that Mr. Tilak's application for an appeal to the Privy Council had been heard before a full court and rejected. If such an application was really made, it is not easy to understand its purpose. It is not for

the High Court of Bombay to determine whether in such a case application may be made to the Privy Council. If a point of law had been reserved by the Judge, or if the Advocate-General had given his *fiat* for a re-hearing, the matter would no doubt have been determined by the High Court. But, as we understand the procedure, an application to the Privy Council is independent of the High Court and may yet be made in Mr. Tilak's case. If such an application should be made, the Privy Council would probably hear it, and, although it might not grant the appeal, it might according to precedent take some other important step provided that it were satisfied that something less than justice had been done. It has been generally assumed at home that Mr. Tilak's jury necessarily consisted of equal numbers of Indians and Englishmen. That is a mistake. The composition of the jury, whatever it may have been, and one will not know that until one sees the names, was controlled by the accident of a sort of ballot. It is to be remarked that Mr. Justice Strachey sentenced Mr. Tilak to rigorous imprisonment. The sentence is, of course, within the law. But the law also permits simple imprisonment, which is plainly not severe enough for Mr. Strachey's taste. The severity of rigorous imprisonment for eighteen months—a far harder thing than the hard labour of English prisons—is in the case of a man of Mr. Tilak's temperament and physique merely inconceivable. His prison, no doubt, will be the hospital. But the nature of the sentence, like the tone of the summing-up, indicates the judge's frame of mind. The most charitable supposition is that he acted, not vindictively, but as a victim of the really humiliating panic which seems to have taken possession, if not of Anglo-Indian society, at least of the Anglo-Indian press. A more suitable case for the equitable intervention of the Privy Council it would not be easy to find. The real question is, whether Mr. Tilak's conduct was or was not consistent with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government. Extracts from the incriminated articles—and it seems fair to assume that the worst passages were extracted—have been printed in the English press. Will any candid reader deny that they were compatible with a law-abiding disposition? For our part, we find it impossible to conceive that an Indian in the position of Mr. Tilak should be capable of thinking that the overthrow of British rule in India would benefit either his fellow-countrymen or himself. Yet that is the thought which Mr. Strachey's verdict and sentence ascribe to him. To incite to sedition is to incite to the subversion of the established government. What possible object could a man like Mr. Tilak hope to compass by such means? Political speakers and writers in England may advocate Indian Home Rule as a goal for British statesmanship to aim at. But we have never yet met with an Indian who believed either that Indians could wholly govern India or that any other foreign rule would be more acceptable to them than British rule. Educated Indians—the Indians of the National Congress—accept the permanence of British rule in India as the starting-point of their hopes for the future, and they seek to make that permanence

secure by removing from British rule the elements of weakness—arising chiefly from imperfect knowledge and its offspring, imperfect sympathy—which undoubtedly impair its hold upon the affections of the people. The anarchists of the Anglo-Indian press stigmatise this attitude as sedition, thereby committing the crime which they condemn. Men like Mr. Tilak, we are convinced, know that the interests of their country are bound up with the permanence of British rule. They know, also, that to a government situated as the Government of India is the friendly advice and warning of journals which are closely in touch with the mass of the people are, or ought to be, highly useful. Can anybody point to anything in the *Kesari* that is inconsistent with this temper?

The truth is, no doubt, that the prosecution of Mr. Tilak, and the many other prosecutions for sedition which have lately occurred in India, would not have occurred at all if the foul crimes of June 22 had not been committed. The attitude of mind induced in Anglo-Indians of the less judicial type by the assassination of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst makes it easy to leap to conclusions, and to read a sinister meaning into innocent words and deeds. But it is an attitude of mind against which civilised rulers should be on their guard, and especially rulers exercising authority on Indian soil in the midst of a vast population which they do not, and to some extent we fear will not, understand. Acts like the deportation of the brothers Natu, and the sentences of transportation for life and for seven years upon the editor and the publisher of the *Mahrani*, not only stink in the nostrils of Englishmen at home. They also do infinitely more harm than good in India, because, quite apart from the injustice done to individuals, they point to government controlled not by reason, but by panic. The deportation of the brothers Natu, for which, under the Regulation of 1827, it appears that the Governor of Bombay is personally responsible, has struck terror into thousands of innocent men in India. So grave a step, one naturally supposes, must have been taken upon some sort of definite information. But if the information appeared to be substantial, why were not the suspects brought to trial? Medieval methods of the kind adopted are baffling and disconcerting to those who would gladly see the Government of India establishing itself more and more firmly upon the sure ground of popular confidence and affection. Within what time, one would like to know, are the brothers Natu to be brought to trial? Or is no trial contemplated? Meantime, is it the case that while the Regulation provides for the attachment of "estates and lands" only—in other words, of immoveable property—the moveable property of the Natus, including jewels to the value of many lakhs, has been attached as well? Has the Government of Bombay, chafing at the excessive scrupulousness of its legalised though essentially despotic powers, overstepped their limits? As for the Satara sentences, it would be difficult to express one's sense of their iniquity in adequate terms. Even the India Office appears to have gone out of its way to apologise for them, and to explain, through the convenient medium of Reuter, that they are subject to

revision by the High Court. Professor Murray, of Glasgow, probably expressed the general feeling when he said: "No mention is made of incitements to murder or to political violence; and unless some offence at least as grave as these be hidden in the background, it will be difficult for the ordinary Englishman, to acquit his Indian officials of acting in a spirit of revenge or panic." The assassinations at Poona, and a hasty theory regarding them, are at the bottom of the whole series of humiliating blunders. The authorities in India leapt to the conclusion that the crimes were the result of a widespread conspiracy. Yet the offer of a reward of enormous amount in the eyes of the average Indian, together with the promise of a free pardon to any person cognisant, though not actually guilty, of the murders, has so far produced no charge, not even a false one. That does not wear the look of conspiracy. On the other hand, it is becoming more and more clear that the plague administration at Poona, with which the assassinations have been (perhaps too hastily) associated, gave great offence to an excited and almost despairing population. One sees it stated that Sir William Wedderburn, in the House of Commons, "put on a white sheet and apologised for having supported the memorials." Sir William Wedderburn did nothing of the kind. He expressed his regret for having indirectly aided in giving currency to a particular charge which was not substantiated. That particular charge, which was based upon private correspondence, had absolutely no connexion with the Poona Memorial of May 10, which the Government of Bombay so disastrously neglected. Sir W. Wedderburn neither supported this memorial nor apologised for it. He asked Lord George Hamilton whether he had seen it, and by his timely intervention at a season of uncommon difficulty in the House of Commons prevented the press-gagging Act which was threatened by the Secretary of State and eagerly demanded by the yelling Tory pack below the gangway. The Poona Memorial, which has never needed apology, is now receiving support from unexpected quarters. Dr. Barry, who was appointed by the Collector of Poona to examine the sanitary condition of the city, and whose report encouraged the *Times* to print an unusually mischievous and unfair article on "Brahmin Self-Government," has made an important statement. He was the special medical officer at Poona while the plague was rife, and he says that as he was frequently engaged at the plague hospital the European soldiers placed at his disposal for plague duty "were left to themselves all over the city without an officer to keep them in hand." This statement reminds one of the similar statement in the *Times of India* of June 18, that the soldiers "worked in all sorts of out-of-the-way places, far from the cognizance of their officers." Dr. Barry adds that he had no complaint of misbehaviour, but, of course, he was not the officer to whom such complaints would naturally be addressed. They were made to the Plague Committee and afterwards to the Government of Bombay. The authorities in India will not make good their slackness in dealing with those complaints by harsh treatment of native

editors and other suspects. Press prosecutions are, at the best, merely symptomatic treatment. At the worst they mean government by panic, which can lead only to disaster.

THE COST OF THE "FORWARD" FOLLY.

"THIS SILENT BLEEDING TO DEATH."

"If we enter on a course of successive measures of fresh taxation, Russia, without moving a man or a gun, need only bide her time. If slow and sure is her game, surely and slowly we shall be playing her hand for her."—*Sir Auckland Colvin.*

"The facts which I have brought to your notice may be briefly recapitulated—an eastern country governed in accordance with expensive Western ideas; an immense and poor population; a narrow margin of possible additional revenue; a constant tendency for expenditure to outgrow revenue; a system of government in India favourable to increase of, and unfavourable to reduction of, expenditure; no financial control by intelligent and well-informed public opinion either in India or in England; an insufficient check on expenditure in India; a remote and imperfect control exercised from England; a revenue specially liable to fluctuations year to year, and growing foreign payments."—*Sir David Barbour.*

By the courtesy of Colonel H. B. Hanna (formerly belonging to the Punjab Frontier Force and late commanding at Delhi) we are able to reproduce from his admirable little book, "Backwards or Forwards?" (Westminster: A. Constable and Co.) the accompanying table, containing "the official confession of the cost of the Forward Policy to the people of India, a confession that is very far from telling the whole tale of cruel exactions and dangerous waste which is the true history of that policy."

The table, it is to be noted, does not represent fully even the *direct* cost of the forward policy to India. Deceptive classifications in the official accounts make it impossible to compile a full statement.

Nor does the table throw any light on the *indirect* price which the indigent taxpayers of India have had to pay. As Colonel Hanna says:—"When we consider the enormous amount of labour which, during the last eighteen [now, nineteen] years, has been turned more or less by force into unproductive channels, and the vast number of lives sacrificed whether in the making of military roads and railways or in the transport of stores of all kinds to distant outposts; when we add to this drain upon India's first element of prosperity—her industrial population—the waste of her resources in the shape of beasts of burden—camels, mules, ponies, donkeys, and bullocks—withdrawn for the same purposes from the service of the peasant in districts where not only the actual cultivation of the soil, but often the very possibility of such cultivation depends upon their use, and from the service of the trader in regions where trade has no other means of transit, we stand aghast at this silent bleeding to death of a people whom most Englishmen honestly desire to benefit."

**STATEMENT SHOWING APPROXIMATE COST OF THE FORWARD POLICY ON THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER
UP TO 1896, INCLUDING THE AFGHAN WAR OF 1878-79-80.**

	<i>Rupees.</i>	
I. The Afghan War	223,110,000 ¹	Sir Evelyn Baring, Financial Member of the Viceroy's Council.
II. Military Railways on the North-West Frontier since the War ..	163,967,910 ²	Administrative Reports on Railways in India.
III. Beluchistan Agency since the War. Government Allotment, Rs. 865,600 per annum for sixteen years	13,849,600	{ <i>Moral and Material Progress of India</i> , 1893-94, p. 157.
IV. Special Grants to Beluchistan Agency—		Financial Statements—
Reservoir in Pishin Rs. 261,240		1889-90, p. 16, par. 31.
Quetta Water Works 499,000	1,134,240	1891-92, ,, 23, ,, 16.
Buildings at Quetta 374,000		1892-93, ,, 32, ,, 84.
V. Lease of Quetta District, and subsidy in lieu of right to collect tolls in the Bolan Pass since 1883	715,000	{ <i>Progress and Condition of India</i> , 1891-92, p. 15.
VI. Preparations for War with Russia in 1885	22,880,710	Official Estimate. Return, dated, India Office, June 8, 1894.
VII. Special Defence Works on Frontier and Rawal Pindi	30,000,000 ³	Approximate.
VIII. Military Roads on North-West Frontier; expended principally on the Dera Ghazi Khan and Pishin road	2,000,000 ⁴	Financial Statement—1888-89, p. 10.
IX. Afghan Boundary Commissions	1,700,000	Financial Statements—
X. Permanent Increase of Indian Army in 1885-86—		1885-86, p. 22, par. 52.
A. 10,755 British Troops Rs. 95,809,200		1891-95, ,, 27, ,, 118.
B. 19,220 Native Troops 65,924,600	162,286,100	{ Official Estimate. Return, dated, India Office, June 8, 1894.
C. Deferred Pay of above British Troops 553,000		Approximate.
XI. Increase in the Native Pension Establishment, due to the Afghan War, Waziri and Chitral Campaigns, and other expeditions on North-West Frontier	18,591,300	<i>Progress and Condition of India</i> , 1894-95, p. 169.
XII. Cost to Government of Imperial Service Troops	1,400,000	
XIII. Re-establishment and Maintenance of British Agency at Gilgit—		
A. For three years, at the rate of Rs. 50,000 a year Rs. 150,000		<i>Blue Book, Chitral</i> , p. 20.
B. For four years, at the rate of Rs. 200,000 a year 800,000		Financial Statements—
C. Special Grant 90,000		1893-94, p. 7, par. 11.
D. " 481,500	3,005,500	1894-95, ,, 21, ,, 83.
E. Transport 754,000		1893-94, ,, 7, ,, 11.
F. " 300,000		1893-94, ,, 13, ,, 24.
G. " 400,000		1894-95, ,, 28, ,, 121.
XIV. Re-occupation of the Kuram Valley in 1892-93, at Rs. 450,000 per annum, for three years	1,350,000	{ Financial Statement—1893-94, p. 7, par. 11.
XV. Grants for so-called Mobilisation—		Financial Statements—
A. 1889 Rs. 2,025,000		1889-90, p. 24, par. 57.
B. 1890 600,000		1890-91, ,, 8, ,, 12.
C. 1891 2,134,000	5,885,000 ⁵	1892-93, ,, 8, ,, 13.
D. 1892 616,000		1892-93, ,, 32, ,, 84.
XVI. Additional Transport Animals, Re-mounts, and Mules—		Financial Statements—
A. 1891 Rs. 1,321,000		1892-93, p. 8, par. 13.
B. 1893 267,000	1,825,000 ⁶	1891-95, ,, 6, ,, 9.
C. 1894 237,000		1894-95, ,, 28, ,, 121.
XVII. Rise in price of food, forage, and increase of number of animals to be fed—		Financial Statements—
A. 1889 Rs. 795,000		1889-90, p. 24, par. 57.
B. 1892 1,500,000		1893-94, ,, 7, ,, 11.
C. 1893 700,000	3,485,000	1893-94, ,, 27, ,, 63.
D. 1894 490,000		1894-95, ,, 28, ,, 121.
XVIII. Expeditions on North-West Frontier since 1888-89	5,075,680	Official Estimate. Return, dated, India Office, June 8, 1894.
XIX. Minor operations (not scheduled) since 1884-85	3,239,100	Official Estimate.
XX. Waziri Campaign, including cost of Delimitation Commission, Fortified Post and Techi Cantonments	3,824,000	{ Financial Statements—1895-96, p. 15, par. 50, and p. 56, par. 200.; 1896-97, p. 34, par. 132.
XXI. Chitral Campaign, including occupation of Chitral during past and present year	21,500,000	{ Financial Statement—1896-97, p. 7, par. 11, and footnote.
XXII. Khyber Rifles raised after the War	1,398,240	<i>Progress and Condition of India</i> , 1891-92, p. 17.
XXIII. Subsidies—		13 years at 12 lakhs, 3 at 18 lakhs.
A. Amir of Afghanistan since the War Rs. 21,000,000		<i>Progress and Condition of India</i> , 1891-92, p. 17.
B. Khyberies 1,100,640		<i>Chitral Blue Book</i> , pp. 9 and 13.
C. Ruler of Chitral and his brothers 60,000	22,857,460	<i>Progress and Condition of India</i> , 1891-92, p. 17.
D. Gomal Chiefs since 1890 296,760		<i>Progress and Condition of India</i> , 1891-92, pp. 16 and 18.
E. Other small Chiefs on North-West Frontier 100,000		
Total Rupees	714,580,480	

¹ Five millions sterling were contributed by the English Exchequer to the War Expenses.

² Provision is made in the Budget Estimate for 1896-97 for a further sum of Rs. 4,984,000 to be expended on these useless railways.

³ "A large sum has been spent on defences and military establishments at Quetta, including an advanced position covering the place, strategic roads, and defences for various bridges, tunnels, etc. on the Sind-Pishin Railway. . . . An entrenched position has been formed at Rawal Pindi, and a defensive post at Multan."—*Indian Finance Statement for 1896-97*.

⁴ This sum only represents a small portion of the money expended on military roads in Beluchistan and other places beyond the Indus, as large sums are annually disbursed by both the military and civil departments in building new roads and maintaining the old ones.

⁵ Provision is made in the Budget Estimate for 1896-97, for Rs. 4,049,000, "for preparations for mobilisation of the Field Army."

⁶ The maintenance of the Transport Branch of the Commissariat Department cost, in 1893-94, no less than Rs. 3,408,140; yet, in the following year, it broke down when called upon to provide carriage for the Division of 16,000 men mobilised for the relief of Chitral.

WHEN IS A FRONTIER NOT A FRONTIER?

(FROM AN ANGLO-INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.)

What is a frontier? What do differently coloured areas on a map represent? Any school-boy, it might be taken for granted, could readily reply to these questions. And yet if we look at recently published maps of the North-Western frontier of India we shall find that, as regards at least that part of the globe, a frontier is not a frontier; and, further, we shall see that the familiar "coloured-red" of British India is swept over territory that is not, never has been, and never will be British territory. In Stanford's map, just published, of "The North-Western Frontier of India" the line that marks the border in the region west of Peshawur between British India (coloured red) and Afghanistan (coloured green) intersects the Khyber route leading from that city to Kabul, some three miles to the west of Lundi Kotal. That post, therefore, Ali Musjid and Fort Maude, are thus all on the "coloured-red" area of the map, and consequently appear as within British territory. It is not possible to believe that either in this map or in other maps of the North-Western frontier of India that have been published of late years, and in which the frontier is similarly given between that country and Afghanistan, this could have been done without the knowledge of the India Office and the frontier military "experts." It may be accepted as certain that both have been consulted in the matter, and equally certain is it that this fanciful laying down of the frontier of India has been deliberately authorised. The unreserved acceptance of the views of a military clique, whose headquarters have been established for some years past at "silly Simla," has unquestionably landed the Government of India in an almost hopeless entanglement. The North-Western frontier maps of India and a recently published utterance of a distinguished Central Asian traveller on the so-called "forward policy," of which it would appear he is a warm advocate, prove this, to say nothing of the present attitude of the tribes occupying the country all the way along from the Tochi River in the south to the Swat River in the north, who have been stung into the frenzy of a fanatical war with us by our irritating policy, and who are now shedding their blood in the desperate hope of retaining their greatly cherished independence, which we have given them every reason to believe we were bent on destroying.

Those of us who understand the term frontier as meaning the border dividing one country from another country, and who regard the differently coloured areas on a map as showing the extent of territory respectively held by States whose dominions are adjacent to one another, will of course be told that the North-Western frontier of India, as now drawn, is "the scientific frontier" of India. The meaning of this term no man born of woman has either yet ever understood or been able to give of it a reasonable or intelligible explanation. The great belt of country extending from Mastuj and Chitral on the north, to Bunnoo on the south, that is to say, the region bordering the Punjab, the most north-western province of India, and on the far side of which from India "the scientific frontier" is drawn, being of the nature it is, wild and most difficult of access from either side, the term conveys, as a matter of fact, no intelligible meaning at all, and never will do so. It was coined for more than one purpose. One was to throw a halo of profound sagacity on the visionary views of the Simla Vaubans, who eventually convinced themselves that Chitral, if held by India, might be regarded as a bastion flanking the flank attack of the main attack that Russia might some day make on India. All this in a country where to keep a mule on his legs for a few weeks in the year requires months and months of careful preparation. Another was

to reassure, in a certain measure, as well as to mystify, John Bull. He could not be looked upon as the one to bear the cost of this policy, puzzling though it was. "The scientific frontier" of India was clearly the concern of the Indian exchequer, and not of the Imperial. As regards this—the cost of the luxury of a scientific frontier of India—the advocates of the forward policy were wise in their generation in giving it the term they did, for as long as things went fairly smooth, the rupees for establishing posts, making roads, and bribing tribal chiefs in the belt, would be shelled out of the Indian treasury without giving rise to any serious clamour out of India.

When is a frontier not a frontier? Given the map of the North-Western frontier of India, find the frontier. This is what Captain Younghusband, the very distinguished Central Asian traveller alluded to above, is reported to have said on the subject. In the course of a recent interview with a representative of Reuter's Agency, Captain Younghusband said: "The forts"—that is to say, the Khyber pass forts, Lundi Kotal, Ali Musjid, etc.—"are not in British territory." The fighting has taken place, he explains, "in the great belt of independent tribes who can turn out some 200,000 fighting men." It is this great tract of wild country, now "coloured red" in the maps, and thus appearing to be British territory, as we have shown, that it has been "the policy of the Government of India for some years past gradually to get within their control." "These hillmen," Captain Younghusband says, "are never very slow to find reason for fighting, and when they see a post in their country held by infidels it is no very difficult task for the Mullahs to incite them to attack it." And yet knowing this full well, as the Government of India must have done, it has authorised during the last few years, in deference to the views of the Simla military clique, the scattering broadcast of small military garrisons over the length and breadth of this great belt. Captain Younghusband considers that the "duty of Empire," though it may take us half-a-century, will drive us, whether it will "be prudent or the reverse, into effecting control over every one of these turbulent tribes on the Indian frontier." In a remarkable letter by Mr. George Curzon, published in the *Times* when the present Government reversed the policy of their predecessors and retained Chitral, that gentleman termed the policy of those who differed from his views, and who were of opinion that establishing scattered posts in the tribal country was wrong in a political as well as a military sense, the "Policy of Drift." In a letter as remarkable—only in another sense, as the writer was intimately acquainted with the borderland and the tribes inhabiting it—also published by the *Times* at the time, Sir Neville Chamberlain replied that the "Policy of Drift" was applicable rather to the views of those advocating wild schemes of indefinitely extending the control of the Government of India over countries outside and far beyond its proper frontier. As to who was right let this recent statement of Captain Younghusband speak. "Whether prudent or the reverse" we must go on even if it takes us fifty years! The views then published by Sir Neville Chamberlain on the question were eminently sound, as everyone who had taken the trouble to form his own opinion on the subject, unbiassed by the shouting of a numerically strong party, must have seen. That he was one who was fully competent to form a sound opinion on the subject was shown in a letter then published by a distinguished officer who had served under him. General Brownlow wrote that those who had served under Sir Neville Chamberlain respected his "political sagacity and experience, no less than they admired him as a hard-fighting soldier."

If anything were wanting to prove how inept has been our trans-frontier policy of late years and how unsound the views of the military clique at Simla as regards the strategical value of distant garrisons and posts in a wild

and as yet unconquered country, it is afforded by Captain Younghusband's ingenuous remark, "the course [that is, in the trans-frontier belt] which the rulers of India have to follow is practically laid down by circumstances, and is beyond their control." History so far has not taught us that either great statesmen or great generals have deliberately put their countries, whose policy they guided and whose armies they commanded, into circumstances beyond their control. Captain Younghusband added that "the eventual outcome of the outbreak will probably be a more lasting but solid settlement of the frontier than has ever yet existed." Nothing is reported as having been said by him as to the cost of this *probable* result of an army of 59,000 men with 90 guns being assembled on and beyond the proper frontier of India to put down the outbreak. Englishmen will soon have to realise that as regards this, successive Governments having authorised the present disastrous policy, the Imperial Treasury will have to bear the cost, as it will be impossible for India to do so with an exchequer on the verge of bankruptcy. Once this were realised, no time would be lost in giving India the definite frontier on the North-West that stood it in good stead during the Indian rebellion of forty years ago. And those who believe that that frontier is the true frontier in that region of our Indian Empire would be spared such statements as the notorious one of Mr. Balfour when the present Government reversed the honest and statesmanlike policy of Lord Rosebery's Government as regards Chitral. In justifying the retention of that mud-fort after our garrison had been relieved, and contrary to her Majesty's proclamation to the tribes, Mr. Balfour said in the House of Commons, when charged with extending by that act the boundaries of the Empire, that we had *not* extended the boundaries of the Empire, inasmuch as the Government of India cannot use the troops of India beyond the boundaries of India without statutory provision. There had been no statutory provision. The Government had used Indian troops within the territory of Chitral. "So it followed," he added, "that Chitral is within and not without the boundaries of the Empire of India."

AN OFFICIAL "NON POSSUMUS."

(FROM A CORRESPONDENT.)

The other day the papers and Chambers of Commerce in Britain were roused a little from the dulness of the "gooseberry" season by a Report on the Trade of the British Empire and Foreign Competition. That report is issued as the consequence of the circular sent from the Colonial Office in November, 1895, requesting information from all the Colonies respecting the competition from foreign sources in the Colonies with goods produced by Great Britain and its Colonies. Comparative statistics and specific notes on a schedule of goods in competition, including sixty-eight heads of merchandise, were sought. The fat volume recently issued is the result, and there can be no doubt as to the interest it has awakened, or the importance of the matter in hand. At home parties which are frequently at loggerheads as to commercial policy unite in a cordial appreciation and approval of the step taken by the Colonial Department. In the Colonies the question was very heartily entertained, and from some of the chief of them elaborate replies are furnished, which are the result of much labour and enquiry. Very important documents of an elaborate character have been sent from Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, and Hong Kong, raising questions of pressing importance to all engaged in commerce. From every part of the globe, save one, the response to this effort to stimulate trade must have been gratifying to its promoters. Save one—and that is India!

Of course, the Colonial Office could not officially communicate with India, and so, at the instance of the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce, Lord George Hamilton moved the Indian Government to attend to the documents forwarded. "The Government of India," he said, "will be directed to give your proposal careful and, if possible, favourable consideration." The volume now in question contains at the end a return from India, the perusal of which must have stirred up feelings of a mixed sort in some quarters.

No complaint can be made respecting the statistical matter supplied; it is well got up, and in form excellent. The result, on the basis suggested from the Colonial Office, is that of Indian trade affected, viz., of imports of goods of which more than five per cent. is of foreign importation—in 1884, of the total of £7,395,180, £1,718,810 were foreign imports; in 1889, of £11,367,110, there were £3,141,950; and in 1894, of £11,695,540, there were £4,279,230. In other words, the foreign percentage of the total in 1884 was 24.0; in 1889, 27.6; and in 1894, 36.6; which shows an increase, a cumulating and accelerating increase, of 12½ per cent. during the ten years in question. Other calculations show that the figures for the years chosen are a fair average for the period. Then, with respect to the points suggested for specific discussion, viz., price, quality, and finish, suitability of the goods for the market, packing, and false marking, the notes are much like those from the Colonies in their trend and suggestion. The commerce of India with Britain and her Colonies has been affected by, in addition to reasons topographical and geographical, a greater care on the part of competitors for the quality of goods suiting the means of purchasers, thus affecting price; by the kind of articles imported, which in many cases are non-British products; and by a study of the taste and prejudices of purchasers. All these, it is quite clear, are practical matters which are being taken to heart in England, notwithstanding a kind of negative consolation from the suggestion that the quality of British goods in many cases is too high for the purpose sought. Referring to Germany, Austria, and Belgium, it is remarked of cutlery and hardware (and the same applies to other goods, such as metals) that "the same three countries are thrusting their hardware and cutlery vigorously upon the Indian market. Although the articles are decidedly inferior, they are, being much cheaper than English cutlery and hardware, extensively used by natives." How suggestive that Bass & Co. have seized the idea, and brew a specially light beer for Indian consumption! Not less significant in another direction is the reference to salt, which has now to be brought from Germany since a "syndicate combined to pool the profits of English production and raise the price of salt to a high figure," and here the "the quality is similar to the quality of Cheshire salt." Monopolies may suit individuals—they blister communities. These facts are interesting, and they may be found to be of the deepest import in reference to the productive trade of the Empire. They should probably be scanned with caution, however impressive and suggestive in detail, as each Colony almost is for trade purposes foreign to every other, and there may be a question whether the basis of the enquiry, the Empire against the world, is commercially and economically a valid one. There cannot be a question, however, that it is highly useful to get returns showing the drift of trade, and that occasionally in considerable detail.

That being so, although the report from India says it is "slightly modified and enlarged" when compared with the instructions given in the Colonial Office circular—a fact not easily perceptible, especially when compared with the other replies—it must be said that the Indian reply leaves much to be desired, especially in tone and

temper. The compiler makes it abundantly clear that he regarded the whole thing as a nuisance. But, sparing our own comment, the better way is to quote the leading paragraph of the report preceding the tables. Referring to the points suggested by the Colonial Office for discussion (given above), Lord George Hamilton is told from Simla that :

"The last of these heads may be dismissed from consideration with the remark that the Indian law relating to merchandise marks, which is in substance the same as the English law, prevents, or should prevent, the substitution of foreign for British goods under the disguise of false marking." That "or should prevent" is for loftiness combined with recklessness hard to beat. But more remains. His lordship the Secretary for India must understand more, as follows :

"As regards the other heads, it will be evident to your lordship that it would not be possible for us to discuss them as proposed without an elaborate preliminary investigation, conducted by the aid of commercial bodies, and with the assistance of importers. We do not gather that such investigation is suggested to us, and therefore we have deemed it unnecessary to undertake an enquiry, which is more properly one for individual traders interested in particular businesses than for the Government. Some of the information required is moreover of such a nature that probably traders would object to communicate it to us."

Now that reply, this lecture, was sent from Simla on May 26, 1896, when the circular from the Colonial Office had been acknowledged by the India Office in December, 1895. So that five months after date the writer opines that an investigation with the aid of commercial bodies and importers cannot, surely, be suggested to him—such a thing was business—not for Government! Now, the volume itself is the best answer to this—official impertinence. Other Governments have responded heartily. We said that the writer, meaning thereby some official at Simla or Calcutta, opines as above; but this precious document, with its truculent hint that details of the course of trade are not the business of Government, is signed by "Elgin, G. S. White, J. Westland, J. Woodburn, M. D. Chalmers, F. H. H. Collen, and A. C. Trevor," which makes it all the more remarkable. Must we, therefore, conclude that consultation with chambers of commerce and with individual importers respecting the drift of trade is quite beneath the notice of the Indian Government? India's ports dealt with a traffic of merchandise only in 1894-5 of Rs. 182,500,000, and shall it be said of this that the rulers are not concerned, after five months' consideration, with investigating in detail the welfare of such a vast commerce! And how shall we regard the Secretary of State for India's attitude in this matter? He represents the paramount power, the Imperial Government, so-called; but has he resented the scolding, the scorn, the sublime disdain, the documentary kicking, here administered to his lordly, or shall we say his very unlordly, meek self? When the Imperial Government directs such an administrative enquiry to be made, will it be permitted the Indian officials to scold the Secretary of State and tell him that he does not know his business?

The present position of Indian finance may, at least, be shrewdly guessed at by aid of two recent statements in the overland papers: (a) the revenue receipts to the end of July, that is, for one-third of the current financial year, "are a crore and a half worse than up to the same date last year"; and (b) "the cash balance in the Treasuries and Presidency banks is nine crores against fifteen crores on the same date (that is, the end of August) last year." Thus the loss of income and the excess of outgoings present on the face of things a deficit of seven and a-half crores of rupees—Rs. 7,500,000. But this is only on the face of it. The depletion of the cash balance only partially indicates the excess of expenditure.

THE SENTENCE ON MR. TILAK.

OPINIONS OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

THE STANDARD (September 15.)

The facts relied upon by the prosecution are, perhaps, of less importance than the Judge's summing up, and his definition of what constitutes sedition. Disaffection, Mr. Justice Strachey said, meant hostility or ill-will of any sort towards the Government. Whoever attempted to excite such feelings was liable to punishment under the Penal Code. "Not action but feeling was the test"; by which is meant, we presume, that there is no need to prove an attempt to incite active disloyalty. To incite, or attempt to incite, disloyal feelings, or "ill-will of any sort" is an offence. "Comments upon a Government measure if they excite hatred of Government," come within the meaning of the Section; and therefore render the commentator liable to the punishment provided. The law being thus interpreted, it is difficult to see how the jury could have come to any other conclusion. Rightly or wrongly, the judge left them no option. At the same time, it must be confessed that if his remarks have been correctly reported, the judge gave a stricter meaning to the words of the Code than will be found in the explanations that have previously been accepted by jurists and by the Law Courts. The late Sir James Stephen who was responsible for this section of the Penal Code, used the following language:—"You may say what you like about any Government measure, you may publish or speak what you please, so long as you say or write what is consistent with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government." Might it not be contended that hatred and detestation of the Government are sometimes compatible, or in practice may be co-existent, with a disposition to obey the commands of a stronger power? We have it on the authority of a late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal that, in the opinion of the ablest lawyers in India, forcible resistance to Government must be distinctly advocated to bring a newspaper within the scope of the law. Unquestionably, Mr. Justice Strachey has given greater elasticity to the wording of the Code.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW. (September 15.)

It is much to be regretted that a test trial for seditious writing, and the authoritative exposition of the present penal law, could not have been held over some question less calculated to stir to their depths the most violent feelings of the native community. It is not less unfortunate that the murder of two of its [i.e., Government's] officers, shortly after the seditious articles appeared, may have seemed to give to the prosecution by the Government on this occasion an air of vindictiveness and retaliation rather than of a calm administrative act. Public sympathy will be with the condemned man. He will be regarded as one who has dared publicly to avow native sentiments, and to assail the administration at a moment when it threatened the inviolability of hearth and home, and as having fallen a victim to his honourable ambition. The severity of the sentence will certainly not lessen the approval and recognition with which Mr. Gangadhar Tilak's appeals have been regarded by those to whom they were addressed. Justice may have been meted out in the High Court of Bombay to the satisfaction of the Government, but in native opinion it is the Government itself which will be condemned. What it has to do now is to put itself right as soon and as best it can with the local community, whose most valued privileges it has been compelled, however unwillingly, to disregard. The authorities at Simla, on the other hand, will scarcely consider the present moment opportune for recommending a more stringent press law, and accentuating native discontent at such an unfortunate crisis, by throwing further difficulties in the way of its free expression.

THE DAILY CHRONICLE. (September 15.)

Had it not been for the murders of Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand nothing would ever have been heard of the recent "sedition" of the native press. We have no sympathy with incitement to crime masquerading as criticism. But in this particular case the prosecution admitted their inability to connect the murders with the articles. This, after all, is the important point. Did these articles amount to an incitement to murder? The prosecution offered no evidence; and in the absence of evidence there must remain a doubt of the justice

of so severe a sentence on the accused. . . . After all, here is the main point. In all these Indian trials there is no evidence of anything that approaches concerted sedition. Wildness, discontent, mischievous rubbish, there may be in plenty. But we have got on with it, and we shall get on with it again. Prove real sedition—above all, conclusively connect it with crime—and we should all favour sharp, stern punishment. But when it comes to overhauling poems, and constructing elaborate innuendoes from eulogies of picturesque and popular bandits—above all, when the attempt is made to apply to the hysteria of Oriental oratory the standards of a less fervid imagination, one feels that the Government are on a perilous path.

THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN. (September 15.)

Mr. Tilak has been convicted, and though in his case the monstrous absurdity of a life sentence has been avoided, the punishment inflicted is one that could only be justified by a very serious offence. Whether Mr. Tilak's offence was or was not so serious it is difficult to decide, in view of the incompleteness of the reports at present to hand. The whole matter of the press prosecutions and, we may add, of the general policy of coercion in India has yet to be threshed out. But the Indian Government will make a grave and perhaps an irremediable mistake if it supposes that a few years of "resolute government" are all that is needed in the Empire for which it is responsible. Press prosecutions may suppress those overt expressions of discontent which reach and perhaps offend English ears. They cannot in a country like India touch the really dangerous methods of disseminating discontent or even concerting measures of resistance. The difficulty of our position in India is that we are strangers among the people. That we remain strangers is perhaps our main defect as a governing race. But for this very reason we shall never materially hinder the propagation of seditious ideas by striking at those methods of expression which a few educated Indians have borrowed from ourselves. We may be sure that as long as we give our Indian fellow-subjects just cause for discontent, they will not lack opportunity for communicating their resentment to one another. What an editor proclaims upon the house-tops and hands will be whispering in the bazaars, and we shall not stop them though we were to send every journalist in India to gaol. And is it not possible to learn something from this seditious press? When we are told that the people are oppressed with taxes, ought we not to begin by acknowledging the simple truth of the statement, and go on to recognise that this is a definite source of discontent to remove which would do something really effectual towards checking the utterance of seditious sentiments, because it would mitigate those sentiments themselves? The truth is that the adoption of the "forward" frontier policy has starved India. We can hardly expect cheerful contentment in a country which we are draining of its resources in order to maintain a policy of most doubtful advantage to ourselves and of no interest at all to the people who have to pay for it.

THE DAILY NEWS. (September 15.)

It seemed at first as if Mr. Tilak was likely to fare as ill; for, according to first reports, he was unable to obtain the services of a really able counsel in Bombay; and Mr. Pugh practices in Calcutta. To us in England it is a matter of course that the worst of criminals should be defended, and not simply defended, but should have their case put before the jury by the ablest counsel they can fee. But in India, very unhappily, there is marked reluctance on the part of counsel to appear against the Government, not merely in a case of sedition, but in any case whatever. It would be a wise course on the part of high Government officials to guide the practice and the feeling steadily into the healthier grooves of a larger freedom and a larger confidence. The case, further, shows that the excited demands for stronger measures of legal suppression of native newspapers were entirely out of place. The arm of the existing law has reached Mr. Tilak in a case of the most subtle nature. How much easier, then, must it be to deal with the more blatant and unconsidered effusions of more excited and less ingenious scribes!

TRUTH. (September 23.)

Our Empire, in fact, hangs upon the religious differences that exist between Hindus and Muhammadans. They do not love us, but they love each other less. Once let patriotism get the better of religious antagonism, and our Empire would be

in serious danger. In the world's history this has more than once occurred. . . . We ought long ago to have endeavoured to gradually teach the natives how to govern themselves. But this we have not been prepared to do, because we know that self-government would mean that India is no longer to be drained of her resources for our benefit. We have so thoroughly adopted the doctrine that the East exists alone for the good of the West, and that Orientals, not being endowed by Providence with the ability to rule themselves, ought to be ruled by Westerners as the Vicegerents of Providence, that we are unable to free ourselves from it. Equality between them and us we do not recognise. They are the subordinate race: we are the ruling race in the scheme of the Universe.

THE STAR. (September 15.)

Mr. Justice Strachey's summing-up in the Tilak case, and his sentence of eighteen months' rigorous imprisonment upon the defendant, may well fill the best friends of British rule in India—among whom we take leave to count ourselves—with consternation and dismay. These of us who habitually read Anglo-Indian newspapers like the *Pioneer*, the *Englishman*, the *Madras Mail*, and the *Times of India* have been driven during the past few weeks to the conclusion that a large section of Anglo-Indian society had temporarily lost its head. But we still expected to find coolness and level-headedness on the bench of the High Court. The expectation, it is plain, was too sanguine. What we find is not coolness and level-headedness, but the unreason of panic. . . . if we had such law as this at home, every Tory Government would be justified in sending every Liberal editor, and every Liberal Government in sending every Tory editor, to gaol. It may be replied that India is not England. No doubt. But the point is that Sir James Stephen's interpretation of his own law might without absurdity have been employed in this country. Mr. Strachey's interpretation would be merely ludicrous. If every journalist is to go to prison who excites small and mild feelings of ill-will against the Government of the day, we had better abolish newspapers without more ado. The sentence upon Mr. Tilak will, we assume, be revised and reduced. But what will be the effect of Mr. Strachey's endeavour to apply Russian or Turkish methods to the Indian Press? If it were taken seriously, it would simply have the effect of driving discontent systematically inwards. That would be a misfortune in any country, but it would be a calamity in India, where by the very nature of the case it is difficult for the Government to be adequately acquainted with the movement of ideas among its millions of subjects.

NEWCASTLE DAILY LEADER. (September 16.)

We cannot congratulate either the Indian or the Imperial Government on the result. The full reports of the trial have not been received, but the telegraphic summaries pretty clearly indicate that the hostile articles were not judged with that impartiality which British justice demands. . . . The weakness of the case against the prisoner was well illustrated in the Judge's summing up. He encouraged the jury to connect the articles and the murders, although the prosecution failed to produce one connecting link, and he gave a definition of disaffection so sweeping that we are safe to say that if Indian law were applied to this country the most respectable newspapers would not be safe one single day from prosecution. Disaffection he defined as hostility or ill-will of any kind towards the Government, and anything which tends to produce this ill-will came within the meaning of the Act and was punishable. It was not necessary to show, he contended, that active resistance was recommended. The use of words calculated to produce hatred was sufficient. How, we should like to ask, would the Conservative newspapers in this country which are applauding the verdict have fared had their vehement denunciations of more than one Liberal Government, with their insinuations of the basest motives, been subject to the test applied to Mr. Tilak's articles? But of course there is one law in India and another in Great Britain. . . . The most dangerous symptom of all is that this campaign against the native newspapers, which have hitherto been regarded as harmless safety valves, is but one phase of a process of reaction which is gradually introducing into India Russian methods of administration. Costly frontier wars are adding daily to the discontent, and the only remedies which the military clique, whose influence at Calcutta and London is daily increasing, can discover are those which the Czars and Russian bureau-

cracy resort to. Let us take care that repression does not generate in India secret societies that may be more troublesome than even those with which Russia is honeycombed.

SOUTH WALES DAILY NEWS. (September 16.)

It may be needful to imprison the man who tries to scatter sparks among gunpowder; but the primary fault lies with those who make the gunpowder. War, pestilence, and famine have made India's condition most grievous; and an enormous economic drain, the outcome of a defective system of administration, has for many years steadily tended to impoverish the country. For the war and the economic drain, British Government is responsible. The pestilence is a misfortune. The rigours of famine would have been lessened materially if the insurance fund had not been misappropriated to other purposes by the British rulers. Seeing that these things are so and that every educated man like Mr. Tilak in India knows them to be so, and that Britain has direct responsibility for so much of the evil from which the peninsula suffers, it is worse than folly to rejoice over imprisonment of a patriot and to fail in recognition of the real nature of the evils he has exposed. The financial condition of India is very serious, and the finances are but a reflex of the whole social situation.

THE VOICE OF THE JINGOES.

In India, where many races are under our alien power, a newspaper in any but English hands is peculiarly liable to be a pest.—*St. James's Gazette* (September 15).

The purpose of the prosecution will be answered if Indian officials are reminded that it is their business to take note of the intellectual food supplied to the populations under their care.—*Morning Post* (September 15).

Gangadhar Tilak has been awarded his deserts, and not twenty minutes more. The sentence of eighteen months' rigorous imprisonment hits the happy man very satisfactorily.—*Fall Mail Gazette* (September 15).

Some such summary indication of the strong hand was sorely needed, and the native editorial eyes should be blinking for some time.—*Daily Mail* (September 15).

The trial will doubtless be keenly scrutinised both in India and, when full reports reach us, in this country also, and it is possible that there may be a division of opinion as to Tilak's guilt.—*Sportsman* (September 15).

The Indian Government gets no prestige out of the case whatever way we take it. The spectacle of the British raj appealing to a jury for the punishment of sedition is not impressive. These are essentially things to be dealt with, if dealt with at all, by power and not by pleadings. There is no question of morality or abstract justice in these matters. We must maintain our rule there for supreme political reasons, but we have no divine right to be in India. Our only right to be there is the right of the strongest.—*Newcastle Daily Chronicle* (September 15).

The acquittal of Tilak would have been a very severe blow to the Indian Government, and might have wrought an amount of evil which it would be hard to exaggerate. . . . Mr. Justice Strachey's lucid summing up must have left little doubt in the minds of the jury.—*The Globe* (September 15.)

For what has happened there is little doubt the forward policy of our Government is as much to blame as anything. It may be argued with some show of reason that to have withdrawn from Chitral after going there would have been a mistake, but military opinion at home and in India was entirely opposed to the permanent occupation of that hill district, Lord Roberts being the only eminent authority in its favour, which was only to be expected, as he is the apostle of the forward policy.—*Nottingham Daily Express* (August 21).

We have no doubt that the conclusion of the present hostilities, when it comes, will place the Indian Government in a very difficult dilemma. On the one hand, they will be inclined to get away from and out of the tortuous valleys and ravines as soon as they can. On the other, they will be confronted with the conviction that if they do nothing but retire, another ten years of independence will have restored confidence to the tribes, and have set them clamouring once again for an attack on the Infidels.—*The Economist* (Sept. 4).

THE DEPORTATION OF THE NATU BROTHERS.

EPITOME OF INDIAN OPINION.¹

THE KAISER-I-HIND (Anglo-Gujerati Weekly), Bombay August 8.

Whatever may be the grievances of the natives as regards the method of administration, this much is certain, that they have unbounded confidence in the sturdy justice meted out both by criminal as well as civil courts. The most uncompromising critics of the Government give credit to them for their even-handed justice. Such confidence in the nation at large is worth much to the Government. Before the memorable day of the deportation of Natu brothers, the most ignorant Indian going never thought that the Government would ever punish its subject without giving that subject a fair trial before a duly established tribunal of justice. But the deportation of Natu brothers has taken them entirely by surprise. It has shown to them that besides possessing other powers for the suppression of disloyalty and sedition, Government have the extraordinary power of deporting bag and baggage without a trial any person whom it has reason to believe guilty of those offences. The views which a Hindu Barrister expressed to a representative of the *Bombay Gazette* were a mere echo of what people openly say, viz., "when we see people arrested and put in prison without trial, we can only wonder who will be the next."

THE INDIAN MIRROR (English Weekly), Calcutta August 3.

That the several arrests in Poona have filled the Indian community with alarm and consternation, goes without saying. Our countrymen have begun to think that, after those arrests, nobody's liberty or possessions are safe. It were extremely difficult, under the existing circumstances, to draw a line between what does and does not constitute sedition. What has particularly alarmed the people is the setting in motion by the Government of India of Regulation III of 1818. The Regulation is one under the provisions of which the Government may imprison and deport any one at its pleasure. That was a Regulation passed at a time when the British Power in India was still in comparative infancy. It might have been necessary, under the condition of things then obtaining. But for the Government to avail itself of its provisions now, is an anachronism. The Regulation has caused the gravest anxiety to the people, and how dangerous its provisions are, is well exemplified on the present occasion. We have no wish to-day to make any particular reference to the arrest of the Honourable Mr. Tilak. That gentleman is to be regularly put on his trial, under a certain section of the Penal Code, and he will have to take the consequences. Besides, his case is *sub judice*. But as to the arrests of the two Natu brothers, that is quite a different matter. It is these arrests that have created a panic among the people, and for very good reasons, for the Natus will undergo no sort of trial, and their fate may be that of anybody else. Under the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code, any one can be prosecuted for bad livelihood, as, for instance, in the case of Rai Ishri Pershad of Bankipore. But that is a different thing. We and the entire public are ignorant of the charges brought against the Natu brothers. If the only charge against the Natus is that they have been taking a prominent part in public and political movements, then the liberty of no public man in India is safe. It is true that we are living under the protection of the freest country in the world, but of what good is that fact to us, as long as Regulation III of 1818 continues to disfigure the Statute Book? How barbarous and unsuited to the spirit of the times the Regulation is, will be perceived from a perusal of its 2nd section. It is of the very greatest importance that the entire Indian population should combine, and make a powerful representation to the Government of India for the repeal of this barbarous Regulation. If, as is sought to be made out, there is sedition in the very atmosphere, and sedition-mongering prevails all around us, we think that, like the Natus, others may be arrested also, and then, the state of things in India will be probably much worse than that of Ireland. We are conscious of the greatness of

¹ This epitome of Indian Opinion is taken from the *Indian Spectator* of August 29.

the Government of India, we know that it can wield gigantic powers. If, then, it is meant to resort to the Regulation under which the Natus have been arrested more largely, and to send men to jail for participating in political agitation, why, it would be better before the Vernacular Press Act is revived, or the whole purely Indian section of the Press is gagged, that all the newspapers, conducted and issued by our countrymen, should cease to exist, that all our public men should betimes relegate themselves to obscurity or offer themselves for immolation, that the Congress should abolish itself, that the Government should enact laws without reference to any of the public bodies, and arrogate to itself utter absolutism.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (English Daily), Madras, August 2.

The political detention of the brothers Natu is of graver import than even the arrest of the honourable Mr. Tilak. The latter has been effected in accordance with the ordinary Criminal Law of the Land. . . . With regard to the brothers Natu, the course adopted by the Bombay authorities is very different; for these two brothers have been placed in political detention under an old Regulation (XXV of 1827) of the East India Company's days, which empowers the Bombay Government to place in detention persons they deem necessary, and against whom there is no intention of taking legal proceedings. . . . That such Regulations exist can scarcely furnish legitimate ground for complaint, for it will be pretty generally conceded that a Government, responsible for the safety of subjects, should be provided with exceptional powers in case of grave emergencies; and when Governments so armed make use of their extraordinary powers, it cannot be said that they have stepped beyond the limits of their prerogatives; but civilised Governments, with well-organised administrations and with the resources of a mighty Empire behind them, are only expected to resort to such measures in case of the gravest necessity. An ordinary first-class Magistrate is provided with very extensive powers, and if he chose to make use of them, he would soon appear in the light of a veritable despot, interfering with the liberty of the subject; but he is not expected to resort to these powers unless it is absolutely necessary; and a magistrate who indiscreetly or recklessly uses his great powers would rapidly find that his position was in danger and that the end of his Magisterial career was at hand. Similarly in the case of a Governor—particularly the Governor of a Presidency which has enjoyed undisturbed peace for well-nigh three-quarters of a century—it is expected that he will refrain from resorting to powers conferred on him by old regulations unless there is imminent danger of the public peace being seriously disturbed. The exact offences of the brothers Natu have, of course, not been specified; but we can scarcely believe that they could have been capable of stirring up a disturbance which would be dangerous to the British Empire. One could understand such energetic measures being taken on the North-West frontier of India or in Upper Burmah, or some similar disturbed tracts; but in the very heart of the Bombay Presidency, one naturally expects that the Government would have no need to travel beyond the Penal Code for the enforcement of peace and order. The region of Poona is surrounded by British territory from which troops could be rapidly concentrated on that city; moreover, in Poona itself there is a large garrison—to say nothing of the extra punitive police force; the people of the Bombay Presidency are not now warlike races; they have adopted peaceful callings, and for several years the Bombay Army has been unable to obtain a sufficient supply of recruits from its Presidency, so much so, that its ranks have had to be filled for the most part by sepoys from other parts of India. In spite of all these circumstances, Lord Sandhurst and his advisers have found it necessary to resort to political detentions in order to maintain public peace. When Governments resort to such measures as political detentions, the impression usually created is that they entertain fears for the safety of their rule or that they are dealing with some newly-conquered or unruly people. . . . The Secretary of State will have to be pressed considerably before he consents to divulge the real reasons which have prompted these measures. If the brothers Natu have been guilty of reprehensible conduct, it would have been infinitely better—from the point of view of the liberty of the subject—had they been charged, if possible, under some section of the Indian Penal Code; but such a course might have been very

inconvenient for the Bombay Government; for there is always the risk of a prosecution failing. Nevertheless, it is not encouraging to see a Government resorting to extraordinary powers conferred by old regulations. There is, however, no ground for any very serious alarm; much uneasiness amounting even to terror is at present felt; but the Poona incidents are, very likely, one of these periodical storms which are apt to burst even on the best regulated States; and probably when the storms blows off and "the clouds roll by," the atmosphere will be all the clearer for the temporary commotion.

THE ADVOCATE (English Bi-Weekly), Lucknow, August 3.

It is useless to comment on this most extraordinary terrorising and un-English procedure unless the facts are brought to light which justified the arrest and deportation of such important and highly respectable persons. The facts, we hope, will soon be forthcoming, if not in India at least in England. This we are, however, bound to say that Lord Elgin and Lord Sandhurst will, in their calmer moments, admit that since the horrors of the Mutiny a greater political blunder was not committed than what was done last week.

THE QUEEN (English Weekly), Calcutta, August 2.

The unearthing of this almost forgotten Act has been most unfortunate. The people are sufficiently excited over what has befallen them. This Act is sure to create a panic. Sedition, if there be any, should no doubt be repressed, but any and every means cannot be resorted to. The measures adopted for the purpose should be in keeping with the prestige of a Christian and civilised Government like the British. The British Government is powerful enough to do anything it pleases with the prostrate population of this country. This very strength of the Government imposes upon it as a paramount duty to exercise its immense power with great moderation. The offenders must be brought to justice but be dealt with leniently. An allowance must be made for the present exciting circumstances. The people have suffered and are still suffering from almost all the ills that the flesh is heir to. Let the Government act like a good physician and not have recourse to unnecessary bleeding. To tide over the present difficulties, great tact and energy are required, but generosity and sympathy with the people are none the less required. A policy of justice and moderation will be the best policy for the Government to adopt under the circumstances.

NATIVE OPINION Anglo-Marathi (Bi-Weekly), Bombay, August 1.

All accounts tell us that the people are panic-stricken, and everyone anxiously looks about as to when his turn may come. . . . Perhaps the Natus know no more about their sins than we do of them, and, therefore, a judicial trial in their case would have been a preferable procedure rather than the one just followed.

MALABAR AND TRAVANCORE SPECTATOR (English Weekly), Calicut, July 31.

The regulation has the sanctity of antiquity; though until now it was believed by laymen to have become obsolete after the enactment of the Indian Penal Code, and had remained a dead letter these last many years; it has now been resuscitated and put into force. . . . When the Bombay Government punished the whole of the people of Poona by inflicting on it a punitive force, there was considerable justification for our adverse criticism of the step, because the Government, while smarting under a sense of sorrow and passion at the atrocious and dastardly murder of two of its servants, might possibly have taken a hasty step. But it had enough of time to cool down, and we must therefore suspend our judgement with regard to the wisdom and justice of the present proceedings until we are placed in possession of all the facts and evidence in the case. For the present we are bound to presume that His Excellency Lord Sandhurst has taken the above steps after deep deliberation and consultation and under proper advice. . . . With regard to putting into operation an old unheard-of regulation in the year of grace, 1897, we must say we felt it as a regular bolt from the blue, and unless cogent reasons can be adduced for requisitioning the provisions of an ancient regulation, we think it would be hopeless to convince the public of its righteousness.

THE DEBATE ON THE INDIAN BUDGET.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

I.—BRITISH OPINION.

NEED FOR IMMEDIATE SAVING.

The debate on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons was as flat as usual if not flatter. Neither plague nor famine, neither murder nor war, can abate the official optimism of Lord George Hamilton. His tribute to Lord Elgin, which Sir Henry Fowler emphatically endorsed, was thoroughly well deserved. But when Lord George Hamilton says that the only objection to the opium trade is its precarious character, and that the Indian army is too small, he cannot expect to be taken seriously. Happily the Indian Government are far less dependent than they were upon the revenue from opium, and the very calamities which have fallen upon India will enforce the need for economy. The five millions which the Government intend to spend on railways in the next three years will, in the long run, be remunerative. But we wish we could see some sign that the India Office was alive to the need for immediate saving. Lord George Hamilton superfluously, and almost fatuously, defended the efforts of the Bombay Government to stamp out the plague. Nobody has suggested that the disease should have been allowed to run its course.—*Daily News*.

"SIMPLY MADDENING."

If Indian finance is a complex and uninviting subject, we can hardly conceive of anyone better fitted to add to its complexity and diminish such attractiveness as it may possess than Lord George Hamilton. We cannot recall a more depressing and unilluminating speech on any mortal subject made by a responsible Minister of the Crown than that of the Secretary of State for India made last night in the House of Commons. We have no wish to be unjust to Lord George Hamilton; but to see and hear this amiable and mediocre politician talking much but saying nothing, nervously fidgeting with his eyeglasses, and mixing up thousands and millions to a perpetual accompaniment of "tens-of-rupees," was enough to make one despair of one's fellow man. Here was a man obviously struggling—it was painful to watch—with a task beyond his powers; wearily, haltingly, repeating the lesson he had learned from his subordinates; repeating it with many mistakes, without personal knowledge beyond his coaching, and without one original idea in supplement. Yet with this man rested the final word in the many intricate problems connected with our Indian Empire. And the imprishable dulness of it all! The steady drip, drip, drip of those tens-of-rupees that came tripping off the glib but uninformed tongue. It was simply maddening.—*Daily Chronicle*.

WANTED: A GRANT OF TEN MILLIONS.

The home Government has a duty to India as deep as any of the actual administrators of that dependency owe it. We here draw immense sums from India every year, in the shape of interest on money lent, or dividends on capital contributed, as well as in military charges, home pensions, and administrative outlays of a most expensive and onerous description. All that we have done for India in a time of exceptional distress, is to start charitable relief funds throughout the country, by means of which it is possible that three-quarters of a million sterling may be raised. Whatever the ultimate total of the dole, it must be insignificant by the side of India's necessities, which may be computed at four times the sum set down by Sir James Westland. Now, considering our position, these necessities, and the disorder reigning in the Indian money markets, would it not be a prudent act, let alone a wise and graceful one, to induce Parliament to give a grant of, say, ten millions sterling, to help the Indian people over a time of great misery? The money could be raised by a short loan, repayable by a five years' annuity out of the proceeds of an additional penny on the income-tax. Assuredly, a deed like this would do more to consolidate and strengthen our Empire than the building of a hundred ships of war. It may be said that this would be to compel great numbers of people to contribute to the relief of India who have no share in the wealth its possession has poured in steady stream for so many years into the hands of a favoured few among us. This is not so. We all have a share in this wealth, which spreads its benefits through all ranks of the community, increasing the general well-being.

And this is really the one and only national way in which to meet India's necessities. If necessary, we had much better economise elsewhere and find ten, if need is, twenty millions to help that heavy-laden dependency out of its afflictions, than that it should be overwhelmed thereby; for when distress in India does reach the point where it upsets the unstable equilibrium of her finances, the disaster then to ensue will cause all the failures and "panics" which we have gone through since the close of the Napoleonic wars to sink into insignificance. For good or evil, we have suffered the fate of India to become interwoven with our own as a commercial nation, to an extent that demands the utmost exertion on our part to prevent her distress from culminating in such a disaster as would throw all our own affairs into deadly confusion.—*Investors' Review*.

AN EXTREMELY DUBIOUS OUTLOOK.

In reviewing the preliminary statement of Sir James Westland, the Finance Minister of India, in March last, we pointed out that the outlook for the current financial year, 1897-8, was extremely dubious, and that we had not done with the famine and the plague and their consequences; and the additional information communicated to Parliament by the Secretary of State for India last night only too abundantly confirms this forecast. The famine, we are now told, has affected a larger area of the dependency and a greater population than any previous visitation of the kind during this century. This is only what close observers of Indian affairs feared, and in view of the fact that at no time during the past ten months does there appear to have been an actual scarcity of food in India, nor a very serious advance of prices, the starvation having been a consequence rather of the extreme inability of the people to buy food than of its scarcity, it is extremely desirable that exact statistics of the actual deaths and of the circumstances under which they occurred should be pressed for. . . . It is coming to be seen that if the forward policy is fully carried out a vastly larger army than India now supports will be needed to turn to account the advantages which its advocates believe that they have discovered in the forward frontier. For our own part, we believe with Lawrence, that the old frontier was not to be improved upon. Be that as it may, the new frontier is like a great house which cannot be used to advantage without a great establishment, and India cannot afford a great increase in her military establishment. The "forward" men reply that her expenditure on the North-West frontier is of the nature of insurance premiums—that she cannot be safe without it. But even threatened people cannot live on arms alone; they must have bread also. If Indian finance and Indian military policy follow persistently the lines on which they are moving now, India will soon be like a man armed with a most expensive sword which he is too starved and weak to lift—and galled at the same time by the reflection that his sword is as clumsy and useless as it is expensive, and that he could have had a really serviceable weapon at a price which would have left him a little money to buy food.—*Manchester Guardian*.

"SWARMS OF IMPROVIDENT WEAKLINGS."

The silly chatter of a disaffected Babu seems to be the accepted model for a good deal of the speaking that the House of Commons produces when Indian affairs are under discussion. A mere handful of our countrymen, lost in an ocean of men of diverse types, have just played with conspicuous success the part of an earthly Providence under one of the most appalling calamities that can be conceived. Downright famine over a vast area affecting millions upon millions of human beings who, left to themselves, and any set of rulers they have previously known, would have perished without an effort, has been fought and conquered. The Herculean task of bringing food to the swarms of improvident weaklings scattered over a vast extent of territory has been successfully discharged by a little group of British administrators numerically quite insignificant. Another visitation not less terrible, and not less certain to have been met with complete apathy by any previous rulers of India, has been combated with all the resources of European science, in face of the violent prejudices of the sufferers. But the House of Commons sees nothing worthy of notice in either feat, and contentedly listens to a few dreary bores, who merely use the interests of the Indian population as pegs whereon to hang their empty and ungenerous criticism. A group of sedition-mongers in India, who under any rule

hitherto known in that country would have been mercilessly snuffed out, have abused the toleration of the Indian Government by shameless appeals to the prejudices of their countrymen against a policy inspired by pure benevolence. Their inflammatory writings have compelled the Indian Government to take action in the interests of the Indian population itself, and in the House of Commons we find them treated by a certain section as martyrs in the sacred cause of liberty.—*The Times*.

II.—INDIAN OPINION.

DECENTRALISATION.

The National Indian Congress is apparently gaining a victory. Its suggestion that there should be a more effective decentralisation of Indian finance has been taken up in the very highest quarter indeed. We should like to know what Sir James Westland will say about it. Lord George Hamilton in the course of his speech contended that it would be most desirable to increase financial decentralisation in India, in regard to which the Government were considering what arrangements could be made. Why should the Secretary of State contend? Who is opposing him? Anyhow, the news that the Government are seriously considering the subject will be extremely welcome in these disagreeable times, and is no doubt due to the strong attitude taken up by the Indian witnesses before the Welby Commission.—*Indu-Prakash* (August 9).

WANTED: TECHNICAL SCHOOLS.

We are glad to learn that it is the policy of the Government to multiply the industries of the country. This was one of the recommendations of the Finance Commission. But somehow or other it has been completely over-looked. It remains to be seen what action the Government takes in this matter. All civilised Governments regard the maintenance of technical schools as a part of their duty. The Indian Government is apparently incensible to this obligation; and what is more it affords so little encouragement to those who qualify themselves for technical work. What are the prospects that lie before the graduates of our engineering colleges? These prospects are becoming less and less encouraging every day.—*The Bengalee* (August 11).

SATISFACTION AND SELF-CONGRATULATION.

While capable men not belonging to the official service are beginning to comprehend the real gravity of the financial position of India, responsible officials whose right understanding of the position is a condition precedent of all reform are as firm as ever in their old notions, and continue to speak of Indian finance in terms of extreme satisfaction and self-congratulation. No reverses, no difficulties, and no amount of effective criticism from the outside world open their eyes and make them admit the crisis, and think about measures necessary to establish our finance on a sound basis. During the last fourteen years, there have been more years of deficit than surplus, the total net deficit amounting nearly to three millions. Without any serious war, without famines and without any great natural calamity such as has afflicted the people during the current year, the Government has been obliged to increase the burdens of taxation by nearly eight millions, and has been obliged to raise loans even for purposes of ordinary administration. So that the financial position of the Government of India is actually much weaker than it was at the close of Lord Ripon's viceroyalty nearly fourteen years ago.—*The Hindu* (August 24).

IN FAVOUR OF DECENTRALISATION.

Lord George Hamilton said a word in favour of financial decentralisation. We are glad to learn that the Government are considering what arrangements could be made to carry it into practice. Here in India all the local governments supported by the people under them have raised the cry. The recent revision of the provincial contracts has rivetted attention on it, and the manner in which the Government of India have put the subordinate governments on short commons has provoked a great deal of adverse criticism which to this day remains unanswered. The Honourable Mr. Surendranath Bannerji, in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, laid special stress on it and his arguments have been admitted by all to be unanswerable. Sir Alexander

Mackenzie in the Viceroy's Legislative Council and Sir Arthur Havelock in the local legislative Council, entered their most solemn and emphatic protest against the present system, and in India it has produced a strong and imperishable impression.—*Madras Standard* (August 7).

III.—ANGLO-INDIAN OPINION.

UNUSUALLY HOSTILE CRITICISM.

Lord George Hamilton's recent Budget speech has excited more hostile criticism in this country than any previous effort of the same kind that we remember. While the Anglo-Indian press are lost in amazement at his estimate of the probable effect on the frontier tribes of the opening of the road to Chitral, or stand aghast at the satisfaction with which he contemplates the steady diminution of the opium revenue, native critics are startled and shocked at the apparent audacity and unfairness of his statement regarding the Poona assassinations and the arrests by which they have been followed. Not only, it is pointed out, has he assumed without proof that the murders were the result of a conspiracy and were committed for political purposes, but he has condemned the men arrested without trial, and seemingly without any evidence beyond such as may be implied in the fact, assuming it to be such, that they are notorious.—*The Statesman* (August 25).

"PECKSNIFFIAN" AND "VAGUE."

One hardly knows whether to feel aghast or relieved to hear that the cost of the famine and plague is put at eight millions sterling. But inasmuch as we shall not be able to congratulate ourselves that the famine is over in Upper India for another two months, and in Southern India until the winter rains come to avert still worse distress than has as yet been felt, and since the plague unhappily still keeps a firm grip of Bombay and other western towns, it is merely sanguine guess-work to count the cost before the end comes. The same demur may be made to Lord George Hamilton's highly moral, even Pecksniffian, sentiments about the opium revenue, and the predatory habits of the frontier tribesmen, which will be overcome principally by heavy fines and the maintenance of strong and vigilant garrisons, though doubtless their material condition will improve if they keep the peace and let the trade caravans pass unmolested. . . . There is impenetrable vagueness in the declaration that it is the policy of the Government to multiply the industries of the country and wean the people from too great dependence on agriculture. It may be a form of words for the edification of Parliament, or in some way a retort to certain witnesses before the Welby Commission: for our part we wish that for one thing it indicated that the Government meant to press on with every plan for making us independent of the home market in every kind of article of military equipment and material that could possibly be supplied or manufactured in this country.—*The Pioneer* (August 12).

LORD G. HAMILTON'S OPTIMISM.

Lord George Hamilton's speech was more free from somnolent qualities than such deliverances usually are. One almost wishes, indeed, that he had not been in quite such good humour as he was. The cares of a Budget statement, which as its central fact recorded a drain upon the exchequer of no less than twelve crores through plague and famine alone, should have sat a little heavier upon him than to permit him to speak thankfully of the normal tendency to increase of revenue out of which such an exhausting charge has to be met. . . . Lord George Hamilton takes comfort to himself in recalling that the greatest number of persons on relief works at any one time was 4,200,000—"a very large number, but not very large in proportion to the population of 250,000,000." No good will be done, but very much harm, by putting the case in this way. The suffering and loss attendant upon the famine are much more serious than even these figures indicate. The collateral suffering indicated in the high death-rate in the Central Provinces and in the North-Western Provinces have to be added. When a rich city like Bombay has its death-rate doubled, largely through the immigration of starving wanderers, it is plain that we have to look beyond the returns from relief works for full indications of the misery that famine brings in its train. . . . It would have been well if the Secretary of State had said less about the elasticity of Indian revenues until some estimate had been formed of the permanent loss that the agriculture of India has sustained during these

trying months. . . . There is no danger lest a too optimistic construction should be placed in India upon the Secretary of State's account of the situation. Every employer of labour who has been paying grain allowances for months past, and will have to continue paying them for some time longer, knows how little reason there is for cheerfulness in the bare fact that, despite the famine, prices in India have been too low to attract more than one or two shipments of grain from abroad. These "too low" prices are over an immense area double the prices of ordinary years. Their continuance means pinching and debilitating poverty to many millions who have not gone upon relief works.—*Times of India* (August 27).

THE GLUT OF RAILWAY OPERATIONS.

Government, said Lord George Hamilton on Thursday night, was "determined to adhere to increased outlay in railway construction." We dislike the word "determined." It shows that Government is conscious of the strength of the feeling which has been roused against the glut of railway operations at a time when Sir James Westland confesses to a deficit of eight millions, and is reduced to piously hoping that the loss will not amount to any more. But, as we showed yesterday, weather conditions are still uncertain. Large tracts of country are still in the grip of famine. We shall not know for some months whether next year may not be an exaggerated repetition of this, and yet Government refuses to admit the possibility, although we know that it has already been compelled to cut down its mammoth railway scheme of last year. It will do so again, doubtless, when it finds the reduction to be absolutely necessary, and in the meantime it gains a cheap reputation for firmness and consistency.—*The Englishman* (August 11).

PAYMENT IN KIND.

We take the following note from the *Financial News* of September 25:—

"It has been realised by the authorities in Cyprus that the system of payment in kind is not without its advantages. This has been found to be the case in the collection of the cereal tithes, which some time since were payable in cash. It was found, however, that when this tax was collected in currency a large percentage was always in arrear at the close of the financial year, and a certain proportion of it had to be written off as irrecoverable. Now that a return has been made to the ancient methods the Government receives prompt payment of its dues, and the number of bad debts is very small. For example, when the stores closed for deliveries in 1895 less than 0·3 per cent. of the liabilities were unpaid. This change is rather like retrogression than advancement in the system of tax collection, and it indicates that new ways are not always better than old. The taxpayer has always the wherewithal to pay in kind without inconvenience; but when cash was demanded he, like many other persons, lacked the needful."

One is reminded of Sir W. Wedderburn's suggestion (*INDIA*, March, 1897, p. 70) that the Government of India should make an experiment in the direction of reverting to the ancient customary arrangement by which land revenue in India consisted of a share of grain and other agricultural produce.

War is not made for nothing, and either starved India or overtaxed England will have to pay. There are some of the blessings of a Jingo Government—a Ministry of grab-all, which is causing Continental nations seriously to consider whether they will not form an alliance for the extinction of England's power. By great greed of conquest and confiscation the Roman Empire fell. For greed promoted luxury and effeminacy among the classes, and demoralisation and want of public spirit among the masses. It seems to us that we are tending in a similar direction. And our Paganism, too, is no less pronounced than that of ancient Rome, for Mammon is our only god, and his horrid seal is engraven on the brows of our people.—*Reynolds's Newspaper* (August 29).

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1897.

- BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. Tweedie, Major-General W., "The British Soldier as a Plague Commissioner."
 COENHILL MAGAZINE. Vibart, Colonel E., "The Sepoy Revolt at Delhi, May, 1857; a Personal Narrative."
 COSMOPOLITAN. Hawthorne, Julian, "India Starving; Report of the *Cosmopolitan's* Special Commissioner to India."
 FORUM. Hopkins, Prof. E. W., "Political Aspects of the Plague in Bombay."
 GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE. Dunn, Sara H., "Round about a Bungalow in India."
 INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. Seharlieb, Mary, M.D., "Medical Women in India." R. H., "Travancore."
 MEDICAL MAGAZINE. Welch, Surgeon-Colonel Francis H., "The Proposed Measures for Checking Venereal Diseases in the Indian Army."
 NATIONAL REVIEW. Birdwood, H. M., "The British Civilian in India." Oldham, R. D., "The Facetted Pebbles of India."
 NINETEENTH CENTURY. Ahmad, Moulvie Rafuddin, "Is the British 'Raj' in Danger?"
 PALL MALL MAGAZINE. Simpson, Surgeon-General Sir R., "Elephant Catching in India."
 WESTMINSTER REVIEW. "Lieut-Gen. McLeod Innes's book, 'The Sepoy Revolt', a New Book on the Mutiny."
 YALE REVIEW. Lyon, P. C., "The Prevention and Relief of Famine in India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1897.

- BOULGER, DEMETRIUS C. "The Story of the Empire—India." (Horace Marshall and Son) 1s. 6d.
 DUTT, ROMESH C. "England and India, a Record of Progress during a Hundred Years, 1785-1885." (Chatto and Windus) 2s. 0d.
 VIDART, COL. H. M., R.E. "Richard Baird Smith: The Leader of the Delhi Heroes in 1857." (Constable) 5s. 0d.

The forward movement has been made, with results which will enormously increase the chronic deficits of the Indian exchequer. There lies the real danger of India, for we may be sure that the British taxpayer will refuse to pay for the luxury of wars to secure an ever-receding scientific frontier which threatens to make frontier wars the chronic condition of India. Bankruptcy is a much more serious danger to India than any invasion by a foreign foe.—*The Observer* (Sept. 5)

Evidently a succession of punitive expeditions, though they give employment to the Indian Army and satisfy military ambitions for a space, make no lasting impression on these half-civilised and easily-inflamed tribesmen.—*Dundee Advertiser* (August 21).

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of Magdalen College, and Secretary of the Appointments Committee in the University of Oxford, acts as Guardian to persons coming to England for Education, and gives information as to the methods available of Education, General and Professional. Address Secretary, INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools), 44, High Street, Oxford, England.—(Advt.)

WEEKLY ISSUE OF "INDIA," 1898.

NOTICE.

- In accordance with the announcement previously made "INDIA" will next year be published on Friday in each week, the weekly issue beginning on January 7th.

**SUBSCRIPTION, payable in advance,
9/- per Annum, POST FREE.**

Single Copies will be sold at 2d. each, and this charge will not include postage.

Some particulars as to the new issue are given in the November number of the journal.

Intending Subscribers are requested to fill up the appended form, and forward it to the address given below.

"INDIA" ORDER FORM (1898).

To the MANAGER OF "INDIA,"

84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Please send me the weekly "INDIA" during 1898,

Name

Address

for which is remitted the sum of Nine Shillings.

Post Office Orders, etc., to be made payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL, and crossed 4/6.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.]

VOL. VIII., No. 11.]
(NEW SERIES.)

NOVEMBER, 1897.

[Subscription, Post Free,
SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN.
IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	321	The English Prose of the Nineteenth Century.. ..	339
Playing Russia's Game: The Folly of it, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	328	"Disgrace and Disaster"	341
The Summing-up in the Tilak Case, by W. C. Bonnerjee	330	Things of India: Seen—and not Seen	342
Railway Policy in India, by G. Subramania Iyer	332	Mr. Natu's Letters.. ..	344
The Police and the Government	335	The Liberal Leaders and the Forward Policy: Speeches by Mr. John Morley and Mr. Asquith	346
Our Weekly Issue, 1898	336	"A Gross Breach of Faith": Letters from Lord Northbrook, Mr. John Morley, and Lord George Hamilton	350
The Silence of Sir H. Fowler	337	Bibliography of Articles on Indian Subjects	352
"Plaudits!"	338		

Indiana.

EVERY mail that comes from India brings news of the painful impression which has been created there by the arrest and deportation of the Natu brothers under the Bombay Regulation of 1827. Instead of dying out, that impression is clearly deepening. Nor could it well be otherwise. When the arrests took place every thoughtful observer supposed that a responsible Government like the Government of Bombay—acting, it is to be presumed, in consultation with the Government of India—must have had in its possession cogent evidence to justify its action. It is now nearly four months since the arrests were made, and as yet the Government has made no sign with regard to the trial of its suspects. One cannot believe that the Government of Bombay intends to keep the Natu brothers in durance vile for an indefinite time, and it seems to us that the authorities would be acting in a manner highly prejudicial to the good government of India if they did not without delay take the public into their confidence with regard to the case they have against the Natus—in other words, if they did not speedily bring them before a court of law and formulate their charges against them. Apathetic as the general public at home habitually are with regard to Indian matters, even they were startled when the news of the arrests was telegraphed to this

country. Some even of the public organs that habitually support the Government of the day spoke out in no uncertain terms as to the duty of the Government to justify what must be confessed to have been a very high-handed proceeding, taken under cover of an almost obsolete enactment. The general belief in India, however extravagant it may appear here, is that the Natu brothers were arrested and deported from Poona in order that they might not be able to produce publicly information as to the actual working of the measures adopted to stamp out the plague. Nothing but the clearest proof could make us accept that explanation. But this much is certain, the more delay there is on the part of the Government to bring the prisoners to trial, the more widespread the belief will become. We have endeavoured to arrive at the facts to the best of our power, and all that we have discovered in connexion with the matter is the correspondence between one of the Natu brothers and the authorities which we print on another page, and to which we desire to draw the earnest attention of our readers. Whether the statements made by Mr. Natu in his letters are true or not—and we have seen nothing to justify us in believing that they are not true—they certainly seem to show that, so far from hampering or in way obstructing the Plague Committee in their necessarily unpleasant duty, he did all he could to help them. Nor can one help feeling that if his suggestions had been acted upon, and his advice followed, much of the excitement which was created at Poona

in connexion with the plague administration would not have arisen at all. To judge from the letters it is almost impossible to believe that the writer could have had any idea of sedition in his mind. The letters tell a melancholy tale, and we will leave our readers to judge for themselves whether they furnish any evidence necessitating the imprisonment of the writer. A very heavy responsibility rests on Lord Sandhurst's Government in this matter, and the sooner that responsibility is discharged, and the action of Government made clear to the eye of the public, the better it will be for all concerned.

If the remarkable "confession," reported by Reuter on October 4, regarding the murder of Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand should prove to be true, one thing is quite obvious. It disposes once for all of the hasty theory that the crimes were the work of an organised and widespread conspiracy. But the story, as it stands, may well excite a little scepticism. The prisoner, a Brahmin and an advocate, by name Damodar Chapekar Deccani, is said to have confessed both to the Poona murders—in which he had the aid of an undiscovered accomplice—and to the tarring of the Queen's statue at Bombay. He is said to have started two years ago a school of arms at Poona, under the cloak of a club reading-room, and to have applied without success to the military authorities at Simla to be enlisted as a soldier. The refusal is reported to have "instilled in Damodar a feeling of hatred towards Europeans and the Government," and we are asked to believe that he seized the opportunity offered by the excitement at Poona of taking an odd revenge. The passage from Reuter's telegram is worth noting because it admits the existence of public excitement at Poona:

"On subsequently returning to Bombay he (that is, Damodar) failed in an examination for which he had entered, and went back to Poona, where the plague operations had begun. In the height of the excitement which prevailed there owing to the alleged harshness of the measures adopted, it is asserted that several persons heard him remark: 'So many people are dying of the plague; is there none prepared to die putting a period to the author of all this tyranny?' This is regarded by the police as having been a direct incitement to kill Mr. Rand, an idea which seems to have taken possession of Damodar and another man."

The whole story, even if it did not come from India, is, it seems to us, of a kind to put cautious readers on their guard. Coming from India, where a bogus confession appears to be a common makeweight in prosecutions, it will not be regarded as important until it is proved to be true. The well-known Balladun case threw a good deal of light upon police methods of obtaining confessions, and the Howrah case, where a man "confessed" to having murdered his daughter who turned up alive and well

in time to interrupt his trial, was not less illuminating. A prisoner in India often "confesses" under police persuasion and withdraws the "confession" before the Sessions Judge. Nor can a "confession" made merely to the police be used against a prisoner on his trial. In order to be used, it must be made before a magistrate and certified by him to be voluntarily made. Even "confessions" so certified have, we believe, in numerous cases been held to be worthless by Sessions Judges and High Court Judges. It remains to be seen whether this Poona "confession" will hold water. The fact that we have heard nothing of it since October 5 seems ominous.

MR. SURENDRA NATH BANERJEE did good service in putting in the Bengal Police Offences in Calcutta. Legislative Council the two questions

which we print on another page with reference to the conduct of certain police officers in Calcutta. In the first case, no doubt, there is ground for some uncertainty as to what really took place. The Commissioner of Police denied that Inspector Marklew had assaulted Mr. Mookerjee. But it is not denied that Mr. Mookerjee was needlessly and vexatiously arrested, and dragged to the police-station without being informed of the charge against him. It is not difficult to imagine the outcry that would be raised in London if such outrageous treatment were meted out to an University official here. But in India, it seems, the authorities are well content to express a mild doubt as to whether the action of the police-inspector was "throughout judicious," and to take no further steps. In the second case, another officer of the Calcutta police force—one Lyons—is admitted to have been fined by the Joint-Magistrate of Alipur for a "perfectly unjustifiable" assault upon a person in custody. Yet the Lieutenant-Governor "sees no necessity for any interference on the part of the Government." What is hardly less disgraceful than this comity towards Lyons, who did the act of a cowardly blackguard, and thereby proved himself utterly unfit for his responsible office, is the series of delays, arising largely from the indefensible combination of judicial and executive duties in one and the same officer, which for five months prevented the prosecutor from obtaining redress. The terrorism which the Marklews and the Lyonses of the Indian Police Service are able to exercise can hardly be imagined by Englishmen at home. Yet it is, we fear, ruffians of this type who to a large section of the Indian people are by far the most palpable embodiment of British rule. That is one reason among many why the action of the Government of Bengal in deliberately associating themselves with such offences, by declining to expel either offender from the office he had disgraced, is in our judgement

simply astounding. We commend the matter to the notice of the English press.

We remarked last month upon the line which the *Standard*—the official organ of the party now in office at home—had adopted with reference to the “forward” policy. Since our last issue went to press the indications of policy contained in the editorial columns of that journal have become both more frequent and more positive. For example, on September 29, commenting on Mr. John Morley’s speech at Arbroath, the *Standard* said that “like a good many critics of the ‘forward’ policy,” he was “arguing from insufficient knowledge.”

“He ignores (the writer continued) the obvious reasons which compelled the British Government to take measures for gradually establishing an effective occupation of the mountain belt that girds India from the Himalayas to the sea. It has been impossible to carry out these measures all at once; the work must be done by degrees, and, here and there our dispositions have been incomplete and more or less of a temporary nature. This is the real explanation of the occasional misadventures which have attended the operation. It was not the ‘forward’ policy which impelled the Swatis to attack our forts on the Malakand, the Mohmands to raid Shabkadar, the Afridis to burn the Khyber posts, and the Orakzais to swarm round the forts on the Samana range; but the difficulty of carrying out that policy to its legitimate conclusion.”

On the following day (September 30) the *Standard* added:—

“There is now an admirable opportunity for establishing an efficient control over the whole extent of country within the British sphere of influence. It may have been a wise policy in the past to leave the border tribes, as much as possible, severely alone; and to adhere to a system of subsidies alternating with punitive raids or blockades. The gradual but sure advance of another European Power in Asia has made it imperative to adopt a stronger and more adventurous line of action. Statesmen of all Parties have agreed that India must be secured from external dangers; and this security can only be attained by the effective occupation of the Military frontier which would have to be defended. It may be that if the tribesmen had rested quiet, the present incomplete and provisional arrangement would have held good for some time to come. Perhaps, it is just as well that its deficiencies should have been unmasked when it is not too late to repair them. It will cost money, no doubt, which India can ill afford; but a far larger expense might be forced on the country were the opportunity neglected.”

Again, on October 5, discussing Mr. John Morley’s reference to Lord Lawrence, the *Standard* said:—
“When Lord Lawrence spoke of our finding the strongest security against a Russian advance in our ‘previous abstinence from entanglements’ on the frontier, he talked excellent practical common-sense, based on the facts of a time when Russia was thousands of miles away, and when Asiatic railways and telegraphs were still in their infancy. To quote the bare words of Lord Lawrence without reference

to their context, or the circumstances that called them forth, is what in a meaner politician might be called lack of candour, if it did not proceed from sheer ignorance.” On October 14 the *Standard* published another long leading article in the same vein, urging that the controversy as to “the respective merits of forward and backward policies” was “out of date,” that “a backward policy is an impossibility, since the Indian Government cannot retire to the Indus,” and that “the recent troubles have arisen not as a consequence of adopting a forward policy, but because the Indian authorities, except at one or two points, worked on the old system.” We have dealt with the policy for the future which this sort of writing suggests, but it is well that the opponents of never-ending aggression should have before them in a compact form the pleas and pretexts of their opponents.

Our Ally—
Nature.

THE Russians are said to be making some stir in the Pamirs again, no doubt for the special benefit of English Russophobes. Reports are sent to Europe intimating industrious progress in making roads over inaccessible ridges of the mountains, and on October 8 the *Times*, ever willing to oblige, printed this “interesting story” from its correspondent at Vienna:—

“An interesting story reached me a few days ago from a friend abroad in a position to be well informed. He assured me that Prince Lobanof had left certain papers in which he defined his views touching Russia’s mission in the world. Among other things, the Prince pointed to England and Germany as the two Powers from which Russia had most to fear. He believed that in four years, when the Russian railway system in Asia would be completed, there should be no delay in striking a decisive blow at India. If this course of action should be attended with success, Prince Lobanof considered that the bonds uniting the British colonies with the mother country would be materially loosened and that the decline of the British Empire would follow.”

Yes it is an “interesting story.” At the same time, however, the first Russian base—if indeed it is good enough for even a temporary base—lies away back at Faizabad, some 400 miles off; and a long way behind that advanced post there is very significant trouble. The garrison of Merv—or rather the remnants of it—have had to be withdrawn to Krasnovodsk, owing to the prevalence of malarial fever. This breaks the most direct, and only conceivable, line of communication. Not only so, but the malarial epidemic has pursued the Russians into the Caucasus; and “in some places,” says Reuter, “the average number of daily cases admitted into hospital exceeds 400.” When the Russians start out on the “invasion of India,” they will (among other unconsidered trifles) have to arrange for the suspension of malaria along a couple of thousand miles of route.

The Amir and his English Critics. THE troubles beyond the North-West Frontier have illustrated strongly the difficulties of the position of the Amír of Afghanistan. The Amír is our ally by solemn treaties; yet many English newspapers, including some that really ought to know better, have at once taken up the assumption that the Amír was, if not actively participating in the rising, at any rate supporting it indirectly and secretly. This is scarcely the way to confirm the Amír's fidelity to his engagements, or to strengthen his confidence in the English people and Government. Happily, however, the Amír has more sense than his English vituperators. It is worth while now to recall two or three of the points. At an early period of the outbreak, some two or three hundred camels of the Tochi punitive expedition were raided. The Amír at once directed the Governor of Khost to punish any Afghans who might be found engaging in any such hostile enterprise. Again, when the Shabkadr Fort was attacked, it was reported that the aggressors consisted mainly of Afghans, whereupon the Indian Government made a friendly communication to the Amír, requesting him to prevent such occurrences. It is not easy to see how the Amír could hold his hand upon tribesmen down in that region, considering how nominal his influence there has always been at the best. Yet, before the Indian Government's communication reached Cabul, he had done what he could by despatching orders to restrain all Afghans from taking part in the frontier disturbances. Further, the Amír's withdrawal of certain commercial (and no doubt informally political) agents from Calcutta, Simla, Bombay, and Karachi, was interpreted in English papers in practically the same sense as the recall of Afghan ambassadors regularly accredited to foreign courts. Then he was hand in glove with the Hadda Mullah; he provided the insurgents with rifles of the newest pattern; he intrigued with the Sultan through Sheikh Seyd Yahia, his emissary; and so forth. Yet—and this is the astounding and crushing fact—the Government of India has not so much as hinted at the complicity of the Amír in any one of these points.

Ignorant Charges.

THE openest distrust, though not the most reckless malevolence, was exhibited unfortunately by the *Times*. Several persons, presumably in a position to understand the attitude of the Amír, came forward with explanations and declarations in his defence. The *Times*, however, knew better. "They savour," it wrote on August 18, "a little too much of zeal not according to knowledge, and those who put them forward are either very ignorant of the subject on which they pretend to enlighten us, or very confident

in the credulity of the British public." The *Times*, indeed, is well qualified to speak of the credulity of the British public, and to gauge the advantages of an assumption of omniscience. But this time it was totally wrong. Of course, it drove home its ignorance with an access of forcible, and partly self-contradictory, assertion. Admitting readily "that the Amír is too intelligent and prudent a statesman to wish a rupture with the British Government," it yet proceeded to end off the sentence with the obviously contradictory and unproved assertion that "the fact that he has long systematically intrigued with the tribes on our frontier cannot be denied by any one at all intimately acquainted with the history of frontier politics during the last fifteen years." We do deny it, point-blank; and we ask for proof. If the *Times* knows so much better than anyone else, why foist on the credulity of the British public such an ugly assertion without a single syllable of evidence? Where is the official record? And why has the Indian Government taken no steps to bring him to book? Such assertions wear the look of mere bravado. In the same article the *Times* proceeded to say: "Of his [*i.e.*, the Amír's] complicity in the present disturbances there seems no reasonable doubt." Now, why? There is one reason stated. "The Hadda Mullah, who has been preaching a Jihad . . . has long been a *persona gratissima* in Kabul, where his personal relations with the Amír have been for some time an open secret." Dr. Leitner, who has had personal experience of those regions and peoples, has shown as clearly as possible that a Jihad has not been preached, and that the Hadda Mullah has been quite as troublesome to the Amír as to the Indian Government. The Amír, too, in his reply to the communication of the Indian Government, pointed out the same fact—that the Hadda Mullah had in former years incited risings against the Amír in his own country. The "friendly" communication of the Indian Government did not agree with the proud stomach of the *Times*. "Abdurrahman," said our contemporary, "is not a personage on whom soft words make much impression, and it would be well if he understood clearly that there are limits to our patience." He does, we venture to say, understand so much quite clearly. He understands also the limits of some of our journalists' knowledge and sense of justice. The Indian Government cannot proceed to rate the Amír without at least a plausible excuse in the facts within its knowledge. The hot-headed journalist is free from such awkward trammels. As Dr. Leitner says, "any story will do against an Afghan or Pathan tribe"—or an Amír either. Let us not forget that among the apostles of the "forward" school there are very many who would gladly provoke another Afghan war.

The alleged intrigues of the Amír at Constantinople, and the influence in India of English opposition to Turkey, are now all but universally discounted as factors in the troubles. If the echoes of the Turkish slaughters of Armenians and Greeks, in the face of the Christian Powers, have had any effect on the Punjab frontier tribes, Dr. Leitner holds it to have been "of the very weakest description."

"The relations of the Sultan with the Amír, if any exist," he says, "I take to be purely formal, and such as befit the *de facto* Khalifa of all Sunnis, and a ruler of that denomination who teaches Islam and has added to its domain."

In the same article, in the current number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, Dr. Leitner has disposed absolutely of the nonsense that has been talked about a Jihad, as well as of the sinister statements and inferences in connexion with the Amír's pamphlet; and he illustrates amusingly the stupid blunders and groundless suspicions that arise in English minds from ignorance of, or inadequate attention to, the native language or polity. The charge against the Amír of supplying guns and rifles of new design to the insurgents is a similar outcome of ignorance and thoughtlessness. Everybody who knows anything about the facts is aware how careful the Amír is about the disposal of rifles of recent type. Besides, it is equally, if not better, known how diligent the frontier tribesmen are in thieving rifles. If the rifles are not stacked and guarded during the night, our soldiers tie them firmly to their persons during sleep; and even then the rifles are stolen. They make first-rate merchandise, bringing several hundred per cent. on their cost down country. But journalists ignorant of the facts at once rush to a charge against the Amír. Finally, the Amír turned back the Afridi deputations at Jelalabad, and posted up his reply to them publicly in Kabul. In that reply he ridicules the notion of a Jihad, and affirms his rigid maintenance of the British alliance:—

"I will never without cause or occasion, swerve from an agreement, because the English, up to the present, have in no way departed from the line of the boundary laid down on the map, which they have agreed upon with me. Then why should I do so? To do so will be far from justice. . . . What you have done with your own hands you must carry on your own necks."

But, it will be said, this is the attitudinizing of a "savage," when he sees he has no chance; the Amír is making a virtue of necessity. With such as take this view, there is no room for argument. The solid fact is that the Government of India have not a word to say against the Amír. The Amír, therefore, it seems to us, comes out of the affair with flying colours. He has stood firmly to his agreements during the eighteen years of his reign, and that ought to entitle him to the respect and confidence

of Englishmen, in spite of malevolent insinuations and ignorant charges in quarters where grave responsibility ought to be permanently felt and steadily respected.

As if there were not enough trouble on hand already, the Indian Government has been worried by the Home

Government with the question of reopening the Indian mints to the free coinage of silver. We offered a decided opposition to the policy of closing the mints as an artificial interference with the free action of currency operations. We are equally decided against any interference now with the system at work, especially under the existing difficulties of the Calcutta treasury, and in view of the disastrous results of a chopping and changing policy. In a case of this sort nothing will satisfy men but an actual experience, and now that we have settled down to such experience we had better work it out on a fair and full trial, and at last have done with it. Why should there be a disturbance of the currency now? The motive for action appears to have come from the United States, whose treasury vaults have for years been bursting with useless silver, and who naturally are anxious to raise its value in relation to gold. France plays up to the United States with an official lack of insight which would be ludicrous if it were not painful to witness. The allied forces of bimetallism have hitherto completely failed to drag England into the welter. But from time to time the attempt is renewed persistently. Mr. A. J. Balfour unhappily has given himself over to the academic doctrinaires, probably in the main under the influence of his brother-in-law, Professor Sidgwick. In any case, it is a deplorable weakness that the English Government should ever coquette or hold parley at all with foreign schemes for the open debasement of the currency of the nation. And it is next thing to a high crime and misdemeanour even to affect to make India a pawn in the preposterous game. That such action should be regarded as possible indicates an alarming ignorance of the condition of India, or a no less alarming adventurousness of political manoeuvre.

The Real Question.

Of course, the Indian Government has put down its foot on the proposal, and after an unnecessarily prolonged period of suspense we learn (from Washington!) that common sense is to prevail. Perhaps the backing of the Bank of England may have turned the balance in favour of India. For, though the Governor of the Bank weakly consented to hold one-fifth of its reserve in silver (under the antiquated powers of an old Act), yet he hedged his consent with conditions

which practically saved the situation. The reopening of the Indian mints at the present time would have caused grave embarrassment. The Chairman of the Chartered Bank of India, Australia and China expressed the position the other day in very fair terms:—

"Debtors," he said, "would be heavily handicapped, local mills and other industries would be exposed to a serious fall in the value of their stocks, raw material, and manufactured goods, holders of imports would find the prices of their commodities greatly shrunken, and, more than all, the native cultivators would have to face much lower silver values for those products which were exported to gold standard countries."

No doubt, part of such distress would be attributable to the closing of the mints. But that is no reason why a sudden change, at a most inopportune time, should plunge the country into a deeper abyss of pecuniary difficulty and disorganisation. With the decline of the opium revenue there is nothing now between India and bankruptcy except the fact that she is still able to borrow money from England. The situation is anything but creditable to us. The fundamental reason is that like other distressed silver countries she has been spending beyond her means. The true recuperative plan, therefore, is simply to spend within her means. Her burdens must be lightened. The process may be slow, but the real difficulty in the case of India is to get so much as a beginning. One is sick and tired of having to emphasise the pressing necessity of a great reduction of military expenditure. Yet we are in the thick of military operations that will swallow up many years' careful savings, and we are on the brink of a fateful choice of future policy on and beyond the North-West Frontier. If the hardly credible rumours of the proposed increase of the Indian Army by one-third—or by any other fraction—prove true, we are probably doomed to see yet larger burdens fixed on the neck of India. If this should actually be the result, we had better come home. For the Indian Empire, in that case, is doomed irrevocably.

The Indian
Army.

A CORRESPONDENT writes:—"Some good or evil genius has been seeking to grasp the thunders of the sky whilst Lord Salisbury has been sleeping and Lord George Hamilton has been discovering the difference between a promise to retire from Chitral and a military road. He has produced a great quaking, and probably good will be the result. It is represented that the Indian Government, with a bold but undisclosed frontier policy in its mind, has notified to Lord George Hamilton and the War Office that India must have her army increased one third, or say, in plain figures, by 73,000 men. Without this increase the tribesmen may come down to Peshawar,

there may be friendly Mussulman risings, and our hearts may some day be in our mouths. Hence the India Council and the War Office are deliberating, using very strong language, and wondering what is to be done. At its worst, the quake given to England by this thunder-stealer means 24,000 British and 49,000 Indian troops, in addition to the 74,000 and 145,000 already in existence. No wonder most of the papers treat the idea as a bit of madness of the autumnal, political-capital-manufacturing order, but it emanated from a source whence the Government look for support. It came from Birmingham, and Birmingham always goes in for big military things, cordite or Chamberlainite, but usually presented under the idea of Imperialism or Nationalism. An increase of one-third in the expenditure on effective services in India would mean five millions. Birmingham cares little how the money is to be found. What it wants is to have a share in the orders given out under it. This levity where India is concerned is characteristic. The gossips increase an army by 73,000 men and add £5,000,000 to the expenditure of India and think nothing of it. Possibly the genius who stole the thunder was a good genius after all, and he wanted to let the world know with what wisdom India is governed. The military party is dominant just now, and it is talking in camp and grove at Simla no less than at Peshawar of a mighty increase in the Indian army. 'Just for once, I will let the British people see what are the ideas and tactics of Indian rulers, under Hamiltonian direction and inspiration,' the good genius may have said, in which case he was good to India and bad to the blunderers. An increase of 73,000 men and five millions of money in yearly outlay! Here is thunder indeed, of the Hamiltonian kind, to play about the British taxpayers' ears and bewilder the minds of the British electors, and stir military providers and purveyors into a most exciting competition. Of course, it is too much to expect us to believe that this thunder is real. We know that it cannot be so. Let Lord George Hamilton make any such proposition in the House of Commons and he will be taken for a madman forthwith, who has been driven out of his mind by the magnitude of his own ideas, and who fancies he knows India and understands England. It must surely be against him that the good or evil genius has been sending his thunderbolts through the air. Never has he made our hair stand on end with such tragic and tremendously far-reaching ideas. Forty-nine thousand more native troops—where are they to be found, unless he invites the Mohmands, Swatis, Afridis, and Orakzais to come over, don the military uniform, and take arms against their own women and children? As for the 24,000 British troops, they

could not be found, unless the engineers' strike is a Government device for sweeping the unemployed into the hands of the recruiting sergeant. Probably some increase of the Indian army really is intended; a modest half-dozen battalions or batteries, or something of the kind, just to garrison a few places along the main frontier valleys. Anything further than that is surely a joke; a Hamiltonian scheme for letting the sceptics know how easily he could govern an empire, annex a mountain region, or conquer a continent, if you would only give him the men and the millions. We cannot seriously believe that any British or Indian Government is going to increase the Indian army by one-third, and add five millions of tens of rupees to the burdens that already sufficiently oppress the people. It would be simple madness to do anything of the kind: we wish to remain sane."

THE WORK OF
the British
Committee.

PREFERRING to combat only the enemy, we have hitherto observed the rule of ignoring reproaches against the British Committee which from time to time, without a shadow of foundation, find their way into some of the Indian newspapers. But when the editor of a journal so influential and, as a rule, well-informed as the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* gives currency—evidently in good faith—to statements which are probably none the less damaging because they happen to be the merest fictions, it seems fitting that the facts should be stated. In the weekly issue of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* dated September 19 last, an editorial note, dealing with the work of the British Committee, suggests that it neglects its obvious duty in two important particulars, namely, (i) in not distributing to the British press Indian intelligence which might serve as an antidote to the ordinary prejudiced versions of fact and opinion; and (ii) in making "no serious attempt" in the direction of securing the co-operation of prominent Liberal newspapers. To these two rebukes we may add a third, which is equally groundless, namely, (iii) that nothing is done by the British Committee to organise in the United Kingdom meetings on Indian subjects. Let us take these three allegations *seriatim*. As to (i) hardly a week passes without the distribution among British newspapers of some document received by the British Committee from India. Also—though the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* will apparently regard this as a thing of no value—advance proofs of the most important matter which is about to appear in the forthcoming number of *INDIA* are regularly circulated in this way. We may mention also that no pains are spared in supplying prompt and full information in reply to the large and increasing number of queries regarding Indian affairs which reach the Committee from all quarters.

And if the current proposal that a press message should be sent weekly from India to the British Committee be carried into effect, we have little doubt that the Committee will be happy to make all possible use of such intelligence. As to (ii), nothing could be further from the truth than to say that no serious attempt has been made to secure the co-operation of prominent Liberal newspapers. Not only has this been attempted, but it has been done, and, by a pleasant coincidence, especially in the case of the three influential journals specified by the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*. As to (iii) the British Committee has done all that its resources permitted, and is at present making arrangements to do more than has hitherto been possible, in the matter of organising meetings in the constituencies. Apart from the meetings which were addressed by the gentlemen who came over from India last spring to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, a good deal was done in the autumn and winter of 1896-97 partly by individual members of the Committee, partly through the friendly co-operation of the Eighty Club, and partly with the very active assistance of the National Reform Union. Mr. A. G. Symonds, the secretary of the last-named association, which has a large staff of able lecturers, and a large number of branch associations throughout the country, had kindly supplied the British Committee with the names of some of his best lecturers, to whom all available information was and is regularly sent by the British Committee, and who speak and lecture on the lines of Congress policy. To give one or two examples of the work done in this way, we may mention that one of the lecturers of the National Reform Union last season delivered Congress lectures on India at Salford, Gainsborough, Lowton, Denton, and Stacksteads. Another advocated the Congress policy at no fewer than forty meetings, at one of which a collection was taken on behalf of the sufferers from famine in India. This work, and work of the same kind, will, we are happy to say, be carried on upon a larger scale during the present political season. Arrangements are now being completed—of which particulars will be given in our next issue—for a considerable series of meetings, especially in the North of England. The editor of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, having these facts before him, will we are sure hasten to remove the mistaken impression which he has been instrumental in spreading. There are, we may remind him, two ways of working. One is to blow the big trumpet, and beat the big drum. The other is to plod on steadily, earnestly, and without ostentation. The British Committee has not chosen the former way, and is in consequence liable to a certain kind of misrepresentation. But it is discharging to the best

of its power a difficult and thankless task which is rendered none the lighter if there is misinterpretation in quarters where support and sympathy might rather be expected.

PLAYING RUSSIA'S GAME: THE FOLLY OF IT.

By SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

At the opening of Parliament early last year, it devolved upon me, on behalf of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, to divide the House of Commons on the Chitral question, by an amendment on the Address; and I desire now to draw attention to Lord George Hamilton's statements on that occasion, in order to show how completely, within a few months, all his allegations and forecasts have been falsified by subsequent events; and how fatally he and his friends have been playing Russia's game both on the frontier and in the interior of India. Also I wish to ask whether, before it is too late, the British people will not open their eyes to the facts, and cease to follow these blind guides who have upset the best traditions of our Indian administration, and are rapidly bringing our great national inheritance to ruin?

The grounds upon which I moved a censure upon the Government were—1st, That by refusing to withdraw after the Chitral Expedition we had broken the pledges made to the border tribes in the Viceroy's Proclamation; 2nd, That the retention of Chitral, with its 180 miles of communications beyond our frontier, was a grave political danger; and 3rd, That the cost of these external aggressions would be ruinous to the Indian people. With regard to the first point Lord George replied that "the Indian Government from first to last had adhered to every letter of that Proclamation." But strange to say, almost in the same breath, he admitted that the Proclamation was specially issued to the inhabitants of Swát; so that the Swátis were among those to whom the assurance was solemnly given that if they would let us pass through their mountains to the relief of Chitral *we would not occupy any of their territory, or interfere with the independence of the tribes.* When therefore we fortified and permanently occupied Malakand, in the heart of the Swát territory, the act was one in flagrant defiance of both the letter and the spirit of our national promise; and we may recognise a Nemesis in the fact that in the present disastrous outbreak the first blood has been shed in an attack upon this particular fortification. In such matters an appeal to moral duty may to some politicians appear foolishness, but all will admit that confidence in our national good faith is the sheet-anchor of our power in India. Those therefore who have struck this deadly blow at our reputation for honesty have, apart from all moral considerations, committed an unpardonable offence against the safety of the Empire. 2nd, as regards political considerations, I pointed out the folly of piercing a military road through the natural ramparts by which our North-West frontier is protected, and, killing the brave defenders by whom these

ramparts are manned, thus paving the way for a Russian invasion; I warned Lord George Hamilton that, in seeking to occupy these wild territories, the first steps were the easiest and the cheapest—afterwards followed the dangers, the difficulties, and the heavy expenditure; and I reminded him that Lord Roberts himself had estimated the fighting population of these mountain regions at a quarter of a million of men, mostly well-armed, brave, and with an unconquerable love of independence. What did the noble lord say, in answer to this, as to possible dangers arising from our encroachments on the independence of the tribes? He showed himself absolutely and hopelessly blind to coming events, assuring a complacent House that "the most sanguine anticipations that anyone could have indulged in had been more than realised. (Hear, hear.) So far from their occupation being regarded in a hostile spirit by the people of the country, on the contrary they welcomed the English occupation, because it had inaugurated a period of security which they had not known before. (Hear, hear.)" Was there ever such a fool's paradise? He even became jocular on the subject, explaining that the only difficulty arose from the tribes jostling each other in their eager competition to be incorporated in British territory. In conclusion he expressed his belief that "there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned, and which would tend to put an end to these periodical disturbances and outbreaks of fanaticism and terrorism which had characterised that portion of (*sic*) her Majesty's dominions." As many of us knew then, and as everyone knows now, this whole Arcadian picture was a dream and a delusion. In a few short months the whole frontier was in a blaze. But what shall we say of the men whose long-drawn schemes have landed us in these disasters? What shall we say of their foresight, their knowledge of men, the accuracy of their local information? Is no one to be made responsible for all the lives that are now being sacrificed, and the vast sums that are being spent? And this brings us to the 3rd point, the ruinous cost to India, both in blood and treasure, before these warlike tribes can be coerced and bribed into accepting our presence in their country. I anticipated that the noble lord would tell the House that, according to official estimates, the cost would not be great, so I pointed out that, as a matter of experience, such official assurances were invariably falsified; as in the Abyssinian campaign, which was estimated at 3 millions, but which cost 10 millions; and the last Afghan War, which was estimated at 1½ millions, and cost 21 millions. Undeterred by such experiences the confident declaration of Ministers was that the occupation of those 180 miles of wilderness, with Chitral at the further end, would not add a rupee to Indian military expenditure. The exact sum originally budgeted for an account of the Chitral expedition was Rs. 220,000; and in answer to my challenge Lord George failed to specify any approximate amount, but stated generally that "he thought the expenditure would be less than was anticipated." He denied that Indian finance was in a critical

condition, and foretold that, notwithstanding the Chitral business, income and expenditure would be equalised. We know what these prophecies have come to. Two millions did not pay the bill for the Chitral affair; and now, having sown the storm, we are reaping the whirlwind. We have already on the frontier 60,000 men, with transport and commissariat at famine prices; and no human being can foretell how many more millions, wrung from the hard hands of peasants, will be spent before this wretched business is settled.

Now I am no Russophobe; but if danger from this quarter does exist, then I say that those who commit follies like these are preparing India to drop, like a ripe plum into Russia's open mouth. Our true safety is to be found in the wise and humane policy of Lord Lawrence, the "Saviour of India"; masterly inactivity beyond the frontier, statesmanlike care for the welfare of the people within our own borders; a policy resting on the sure basis of a contented people, friendly neighbours, and a full treasury. The Marquis of Ripon, who followed in the steps of Lord Lawrence, further developed the same policy of wise economy and confidence in the people, so that when his term of office was over, some twelve years ago, he left behind him peaceful frontiers, financial equilibrium, with reduced taxation, and a population throughout India not only contented, but filled with gratitude and affection, and enthusiastic for British rule. This I saw with my own eyes. Since then Lord Lawrence's policy, both external and internal, has been reversed; and in a few short years this happy state of things has been upset and destroyed. For the genial kindness of Lord Ripon's time has been substituted a new policy, hatched in secrecy and nourished upon violence; a policy of aggression abroad, and of distrust and repression at home. The fruits of this policy are very manifest: beyond our frontier all is now waste and bloodshed; within our borders misery and unrest.

I will not now further discuss the external or frontier policy of the Chauvinist clique which rules at Simla, and has for its spokesmen Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons, and Lord Roberts in the House of Lords. Doubtless their defence will be that they have failed only because they have not gone far enough. For they are political Sangrados, whose only prescription is bleeding and hot water; if the patient does not improve, then more bleeding and more hot water. But we may await their newest frontier proposals with some equanimity, for even the man in the street is beginning to see that their whole scheme has broken down, and that their fussy activities, directed against Russia, are only promoting Russian interests. Of course the frontier tribesmen, however brave, cannot resist the armaments of the British Empire. The present rising will therefore be suppressed. But fortunately under section 55 of the Government of India Act of 1858, the consent of both Houses of Parliament must be obtained to the bill of costs, so we may hope that some light will soon be thrown upon the rights and wrongs of the case. Also, after the views expressed in the Suakin debates, we may safely assume that the national

conscience will not consent to the whole burden of this Imperial Kriegspiel with Russia being thrown upon the famine-stricken Indian rayat. A large share of the expenses must be borne by the Imperial Treasury; so her Majesty's Ministers may expect a rigorous inquisition into the facts when they place before Parliament an account of their stewardship in those dark and discreditable transactions.

There exists therefore some hope that a stop may be put to the mischievous frontier intrigues and aggressions of the Simla clique, and that a return may be ordered to the sane and successful policy of Lords Lawrence and Ripon. It is more difficult to bring public opinion to bear upon the equally unwise, and still more dangerous, methods of the same clique in matters of internal administration. The delusions of Lord George Hamilton respecting the condition and needs of the rayat and respecting the aspirations of the educated classes, are as absolute as, a few months ago, were his delusions regarding the political sentiments of the frontier tribesmen. But as he persistently refuses all enquiry, there are no means of bringing the facts to light. According to him the rayat is a fat and prosperous person, very lightly taxed, and pleasantly conscious of "the infinite blessings of British rule;" whereas Indian public opinion knows that the rayat is in a chronic state of semi-starvation, "ruined, despairing, embittered," hopelessly in debt to the money-lender, crushed by burdens too heavy for him to bear, ready to perish at the first touch of scarcity and disease. Upon the top of these miseries have come famine, plague, and earthquake; so that the minds of the people are distracted, and they are almost driven to despair; and I ask, is this a time for harshness and rigour? Would not commonsense, if not humanity, suggest an attitude of sympathy and forbearance on the part of those in authority? But such is the infatuation of our present rulers that instead of seeking to calm and soothe this suffering people, they can think of no better remedies than punitive police, attacks upon the freedom of the press, political prosecutions, and *lettres de cachet*. I say that all this is simply playing into the hands of our enemies. In Russian schemes for the invasion of India it has always been recognised that much cannot be effected unless disaffection exists among the people of India themselves. The chance of success depends upon the possibility of popular risings against the British Government in the interior of India, behind the "thin red line" which will face the invaders along the frontier. Our un-friends in Russia and elsewhere must therefore sincerely rejoice when they observe that, instead of allaying unrest and stimulating affection to our rule, we are actively engaged in alienating the most important classes upon whom the safety of our Empire depends.

Our Indian officials undoubtedly mean well. Why then do they behave with this fatal perversity? What is the origin of their extraordinary delusions as regards the plainest facts? The reason is simply this, that they are out of touch with the people. It is the vice and misfortune of despotic rule, whether in India, Russia, or elsewhere, that it cannot tolerate independence: "It is the curse of kings to be attended by slaves that take their humours for a

warrant"; and so it comes that Indian officials usually get their facts and guidance from the time-servers and sycophants who naturally gather about them, attracted to the seat of power. Official information is thus tainted at its source; and a Secretary of State for India has but rarely an opportunity of learning the truth. Occasionally no doubt a man of exceptional independence tries to hear both sides and to judge for himself. And I remember when in 1885 three independent Indian delegates came to England to set forth the case for India, Lord Randolph Churchill sent for them to the India Office, and gave them a most attentive and courteous hearing. Unfortunately Lord G. Hamilton resents similar attempts to enlighten him. But he should remember that it is a thankless and even dangerous task to tell disagreeable truths to those in authority, and this duty is not usually undertaken by those seeking personal advantage. Our Indian autocrat might take a lesson from another Oriental potentate, not an estimable character, but who in this respect showed himself wiser in his generation. When Ahab, an early light of the "forward" school, contemplated an aggression upon his neighbours the Syrians, he was not content to accept the assurances, however emphatic, of his official advisers, but was at great pains to hunt up Micaiah, the son of Imlah, and extract the truth from him. He hated him, "for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil," but all the same he adjured him in the most solemn terms to tell him nothing but that which was true. In this way, with difficulty, he at last got at the truth. Now no such difficulties stand in the way of the modern ruler of India. The educated classes are willing and anxious to act as interpreters between him and the masses of the people. They have no desire for Russian rule, and if he will accept their services in the frank and loyal spirit in which they are offered, the first step will have been taken to bring the rulers into touch with the ruled. During the last twelve years independent public opinion has organised itself thoroughly, and in the programme of the Indian National Congress will be found a body of moderate and practical measures of reform which would go far to regain the affections of the Indian people.

The more we differentiate our rule from Russian rule, the stronger will be our position in India; and those reactionists among us who are attempting to exchange British methods of progress and trust in the people, for Russian methods of distrust and repression, are the people who are playing Russia's game in more senses than one.

We take the following from "Notes on Books" in the *Coming Day* for October (edited by the Rev. John Page Hopps):—"Report of the Eleventh Indian National Congress," held at Poona, December, 1895. London: Office of India, Palace Chambers, Westminster. A volume of the highest possible importance. The unrest in India is widespread and grave in the extreme, and it is useless to ignore it, or only to fight it. The Poona Congress went fully into every subject of national importance, and this report is a verbatim presentation of its resolution and speeches, all of which were of a very high order. The officials who affect to despise or ignore the Congress and its demands are very badly serving their country.

"IF THIS BE TRUE, WHAT DOES IT MEAN?"

By W. C. BONNERJEN.

When about thirteen years ago the Marquis of Ripon was retiring from India, after resigning the Viceroyalty of that Empire, a series of demonstrations were held all over the country to do honour to him. People of all classes, including Poona Brahmins, and Brahmins in other parts of the country, took part in these demonstrations, and they were so spontaneous, so enthusiastic, and withal were so loyal to the Government that they drew from (as was believed at the time) the pen of an experienced and sagacious member of the Indian Civil Service, then holding high office in the Executive Council of the Government of India, and afterwards rising to still higher eminence in the administration of the country, a very remarkable article under the above heading in the columns of the *Pioneer* newspaper. After taking pains to ascertain if the feelings expressed by the people at these demonstrations were genuine or not, and satisfying himself that they were so, the writer in effect concluded that the people of India were loyal to the core to the British Government, and that they had no interest apart from it, and sincerely desired its permanence. No publicist of the day raised any dissentient voice with regard to this conclusion, and thoughtful men of both parties in England accepted the conclusion as being perfectly correct, and until the other day, when after the lamentable murders of Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand the Government of Lord Sandhurst in Bombay commenced the press prosecutions for sedition of which we have heard so much, nobody ever suggested that the people of India were otherwise than perfectly loyal.

In this view it becomes necessary to enquire whether it is the fact or not that the articles in the *Kenari*, which formed the subject of the recent State trial against its editor and proprietor, Mr. Tilak, are seditious at all, or seditious within the meaning of Section 124 A of the Indian Penal Code. The enquiry may be said to be useless, seeing that the judge and the majority of the jury before whom the trial was held, have come to the conclusion that the articles were an attempt "to excite feelings of disaffection to the British Government." With all respect to those who are likely to take this view, I think the enquiry is not useless because the verdict of the jury being only that of a majority (6 to 3) cannot carry that weight with the public which it would have carried if it had been the unanimous verdict of all nine. It is well known that the majority of the jury who convicted Mr. Tilak were Europeans, who presumably have not the same grasp over the Marathi language, in which the articles were written, as the three dissentient jurymen, who were natives of the country, and who, presumably, would have a better understanding of the incriminated articles. It must not be understood that I seek in any way to minimise the effect of the verdict. The judge agreed with it, and it stands as the deliberate opinion of seven impartial Europeans that Mr. Tilak

was guilty "of attempting to excite feelings of disaffection to the British Government." All I say is, and I say it with all respect, that the verdict is one with which I cannot agree.

It seems to me that there is no escape from the position that, for a subject to attempt to excite feelings of disaffection towards the Government to which he owes allegiance, he must be disaffected himself. Nobody in his senses, if he were well affected towards a Government, if he entertained feelings of affection for it, or even if he were passively obedient to it, would, for the mere wantonness of the thing, attempt to excite feelings of disaffection towards it in others. If I am right in this, the question arises whether Mr. Tilak himself entertained feelings of disaffection to the British Government. To my mind it is inconceivable that he could have done so. He has known no government of the country except the British Government. Along with all other British Indian subjects he has received vast benefits from the British Government. As Mr. Justice Strachey says in passing sentence on him, and as is well known, he is "a man of intelligence, a man of remarkable ability and energy and who" not "might under the circumstances have been," but, with all deference to Mr. Justice Strachey, was, in fact, "a useful force in the State."

Mr. Tilak knows, as all his compatriots who have thought over the subject do, that the only possible government for India is the British Government, that if the British Government ceased to rule the country it would relapse into anarchy, and that all the best aspirations of the country would be smothered. For years he has taken a prominent part in constitutional movements for the redress of the grievances of the people, and unless he has completely changed it is impossible to suppose that he would turn back on his former conduct, be himself disaffected, and endeavour to sow seeds of disaffection in others towards the Government at a time when the Government was engaged in doing its best to combat the two dread visitations of famine and the plague. This point of view was evidently absent from the mind of the judge, for he not only lays no stress on it in his charge but does not even allude to it.

Looked at from the point of view of the personal position of Mr. Tilak, the incriminated articles do not appear to me to express anything like what Mr. Justice Strachey told the jury would be within the explanation to Section 124 A of the Indian Penal Code. He says "a man may express the strongest condemnation of such measures"—he had previously referred to the Income Tax Act, the Epidemic Diseases Act, military expeditions, suppression of plague or famine, and the administration of justice—"and he may do so severely and even unreasonably, perversely and unfairly. So long as he confines himself to that he will be protected by the explanation." As far as I can judge, the articles in question do not come near this at all. Mr. Justice Strachey continues,

"but if he goes beyond that, and whether in the course of comments upon measures or not holds up the Government itself to the hatred or contempt of his readers, as, for instance, by attributing to it every sort of evil and misfortune suffered

by the people, or dwelling adversely on its foreign origin and character or imputing to it base motives or accusing it of hostility or indifference to the welfare of the people, then he is guilty under the section and the explanation will not save him."

There is a subtlety, I had almost said metaphysical fineness, in this exposition of the law which it is not easy to grasp. One may, says the judge, express the strongest condemnation of the measures of Government, but may not hold up the Government itself to the hatred or contempt of his readers. What is meant by "the Government itself?" Who are to be taken as being included in it? Do the words only mean the Governor and his Executive Council, or do they mean all persons entrusted with legislative, executive and judicial functions? If the words "the Government itself" are to be taken as meaning all these persons, then according to Mr. Justice Strachey, ridiculing a policeman on his beat and so holding him up to the contempt of the bystanders would apparently be sedition. I hardly think the judge intended to go so far as this.

Strongest condemnation of measures proceeding from human beings acting singly or conjointly with others necessarily implies condemnation of the persons passing them. The measures must be bad indeed to merit strong condemnation; and what does this condemnation mean except that the authors of the measures are either perverse, wrong-headed, or incompetent? And when persons are held up before the public as being perverse, wrong-headed, or incompetent, what are the feelings that would be excited in the public mind with regard to them? Would it be feelings of admiration and love, or of hatred and contempt? In such serious matters as sedition or seditious libel, the only safe standpoint, as it seems to me, is to see as far as possible what the motive of the writer was in writing the articles.

What was Mr. Tilak's motive in publishing the articles which have been held to bring him within the meaning of section 124 A? Did he intend that they should excite feelings of disaffection towards the Government, or did he intend to bring to the notice of the Government what was being said by the people of Poona with regard to their uneasiness? He was the editor of a vernacular journal, and as such had a twofold duty to perform—first, to bring to the notice of the rulers the voice of the people; secondly, to explain to the people the measures of the rulers. If the people reasonably or unreasonably say what is not creditable to the Government I hold it to be the duty of an editor to bring this state of things to the notice of the Government by giving it publicity in the columns of his newspaper, and the articles in the *Kesari* did but give voice to what the people at Poona were saying amongst themselves with reference to their grievances.

One of the instances which Mr. Justice Strachey gives as to how "the Government itself" might be held up to the "hatred or contempt" of the people is very unfortunate in the circumstances of India. He says that the Government might be held up to the contempt of the people,

"by attributing to it every sort of evil and misfortune suffered by the people."

He evidently has not read much of the ancient

literature of the land of which he is now one of the judges. If he had done so, he would have known that it has been ingrained in the minds of the Hindu people (at any rate from before the time when Yudisthira, of *Mahabharata* fame, was king) that no evil or misfortune befalls the country except owing to the sinfulness or shortcomings of the rulers. The belief in question, as a moment's reflection would show, does not proceed from any "feelings of disaffection" to the Government but from an exaggerated notion of the purity and wisdom of the rulers.

I cannot help feeling that the Press prosecutions in the Bombay Presidency have been a mistake from beginning to end. The assumption that people are likely to be imbued with feelings of disaffection to the Government by articles in the newspaper press is an unfortunate one. If, after so many years of British rule, articles in the newspaper press are able to make the generality of the people disaffected towards the Government, then indeed that Government cannot be said, as it is said on all hands, to have been a successful one. There is no doubt that the murders of Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand created a panic in Government circles in Bombay. The panic deepened when, with large rewards and promises of pardon to accomplices, no information as to the perpetrators was obtained. It was unthinkingly concluded that there was an organised conspiracy which brought about the murders. This belief helped to intensify the panic, and to save themselves from the charge of inactivity the Government have laid a heavy hand upon the unfortunate editors of the vernacular journals of Poona.

RAILWAY POLICY IN INDIA.

By G. SUBRAMANIA IYER.

On no question raised by the Indian witnesses in their evidence before the Indian Expenditure Commission was there greater difficulty in bringing home to the members of the Commission the Indian point of view than on the question of the extension of railways in India. To the majority of the Commission—that is, to the whole Commission except the three members that represent India—the present policy of pushing forward railway construction with enormous borrowed funds appears to be an unmixed blessing. They seem to think that nothing but good can result from the breathless activity shown by the Government of India in widening the network of railways, by which it is hoped that the people will be completely protected against future famines, and that incalculable material and moral benefits will accrue in proportion to the length of railways. But the Indian witnesses contended that the benefits of railways were a great deal exaggerated, and the peculiar economic conditions of India rendered a less rapid progress the wiser policy. In the present article I shall try to prove that Lord Welby and his official colleagues on the Commission are wrong, and the Indian witnesses are right. If India were a self-governing country without the serious evil of foreign domination, not only in

the public service, but in the management of railways and every other large enterprise, perhaps Lord Welby's contention would be sound. His lordship repeatedly pointed out in the cross-examination of the witnesses that most countries in the world engaged in a vigorous prosecution of railway construction borrowed the required capital from England, and that this fact was not looked upon as a source of economic evil. True, Australia, China, Japan, and other countries obtain their capital for this purpose from foreign markets and they pay large amounts of interest to their foreign creditors. It cannot be denied that this foreign payment is an evil in these countries as well as in India; at all events they would avoid it, if they could. But these countries enjoying the blessings of self-government and not being liable to foreign drain by other channels, the evil is almost imperceptible. But what is the case in regard to India? India has her wealth drained into foreign countries to the extent of 30 millions sterling every year, and her people are exceedingly poor with a heavy and oppressive burden of taxation to bear; and this great fact distinguishes India from all other countries in the world, and introduces in the consideration of her political and economic questions a point of view which does not arise in self-governing countries like Australia and China. Amidst this enormous drain which, as Lord Salisbury observed, is bleeding India to exhaustion, the payment of nearly three millions every year as interest on her railway expenditure is not a small matter. It would be different if India had no drain of her money in other ways, and if she had only to pay the interest on foreign capital raised for this purpose. And then there is another difference between India and other countries in this respect. In Australia, for instance, to which Lord Welby frequently referred, the railways are not administered by a large number of foreigners in receipt of handsome salaries. In India, on the other hand, nearly two thousand six hundred Europeans employed in the management of railways already constructed are at present in receipt of salaries aggregating every year to the large amount of nearly eight hundred thousand pounds. These eight hundred thousand pounds include only the salaries of Europeans holding higher appointments. There are in almost every railway a host of young men employed to do ministerial work. It should be remembered that every European employed in this manner not only takes away the bread from the mouth of an Indian who would otherwise take his place, but also takes away the opportunity of a training in public administrative work which the Indians would otherwise have. Thus, in addition to the enormous foreign drain of India's wealth as the result of her foreign domination, the army of Europeans employed in the administration of the railways, and the loss of opportunities for administrative training that I have referred to, constitute the radical difference between India and other countries in respect of the construction of railways, and this difference it was extremely difficult to make the Commissioners comprehend. The Commissioners probably think that with all these evils which must be admitted, there are advantages which more than

compensate for them and which justify the policy of extending this means of communication as rapidly as possible. But we endeavoured to point out that these compensating advantages are exaggerated and in many respects imaginary.

Lord Welby laid stress on the fact that the railways would be of invaluable service in times of famine by bringing into the affected areas food stuff not merely from the unaffected areas of India itself, but from all parts of the world. At first sight there appears to be a good deal of truth in this. But, as a fact, have the 20,000 miles of railway that now traverse the country prevented a famine? Since the last great famine more than 10,000 miles have been constructed, and who would deny that the present famine has proved disastrous to the people?

I do not for a moment deny that railways have been highly useful in transporting food from one part of the country to another, and thereby have made food to some extent available in the afflicted areas. But railways do not transport food for nothing. The process of transportation costs money, and at the place where grain is brought for consumption, it can be sold only at prices higher than those of normal years. The theory that grains can be imported into India from foreign countries and that in times of scarcity India would indent on other parts of the world, has not been found to hold good in the present famine. The much talked of relief from America and Russia has not come, for the very obvious and sufficient reason that private enterprise cannot undertake the transportation without profit, and it would not pay to bring wheat all the way down from America or Russia to India. The fact is, the Indian famine is as much of money as of grain; perhaps it is becoming more and more the former than the latter. The Indian people are becoming more and more impoverished, and even when the grain is available, there must be money to buy it with, which money is not forthcoming. It appears to me therefore that the theory that railways are the panacea of all the economic evils of India is a fallacy.

It is urged by the exponents of official opinion that railways tend to raise the prices of agricultural produce and thereby benefit the cultivators. I doubt whether the so-called rise in the prices is the result of an increase in the prosperity of the people. The official figures representing the rise in prices are misleading, because they include prices in years of drought and abnormal seasons and in places where large numbers of people more or less temporarily congregate on account of large public works executed by Government. If allowance were made for these as well as for the prices in large cities where they must be higher than elsewhere, I am not sure that in the villages any considerable rise in the prices of grain can be proved. Still, granting that there has been a genuine rise in the prices, let us consider whether it is of any real good to the cultivator. So far as his payment to the Government goes, he would be no doubt a gainer. For while the assessment is unchanged for a period of years, he could pay it, if the prices had risen, by disposing of a smaller quantity of his produce. But even here, there is a

lurking fallacy. The arrangements for the payment of the demand by Government are such that the rayat is forced to dispose of his produce at a time of the year when the produce sells cheapest. The time for the payment is fixed about the harvest time to enable the rayat to satisfy the demand easily. But this very fact brings an enormous quantity of the produce to the market in a forced manner, and the excessive and unnatural glut in the market tends to the lowering of prices. The middleman takes advantage of the rayat's difficulty, and buys up the available grain and stores it in order that he may sell it when the prices are most dear. In many instances, the rayat sells off most of the grain he has, and having consumed in a few months what little remained, he buys his food when it is dear. Apart from this payment of the Government demand, the rise in prices does not at all help the rayats. The majority of the landholders paying tax to Government in all parts of the country, except where the system of permanent settlement prevails, are exceedingly poor, holding a property of five acres or so. In the Presidency of Madras two-thirds of these hold such petty properties that they pay no more than ten rupees a year to the Government, an amount which, according to the theory of the settlement, represents one-half of the landholders' net produce. In other words, two-thirds of the landholders of Southern India derive from their land an income of no more than ten rupees after paying the Government's demand. Surely, such poor people cannot benefit much from increased prices. What is left after the payment of the Government's demand is mostly taken by the rayat's creditors, so that his actual food, as well as other articles of consumption, such as the condiments, fuel, clothes, etc., he has to buy in the market. Thus, it will be seen, the rayat is not a gainer from the so-called increase in prices; on the other hand the real gainer is the middleman.

There is also another point of view from which the extension of railways is not an unmixed blessing in India. Railways necessarily tend to upset the old indigenous industrial system. India is not a new country where the people are a newly settled community with a civilization yet to grow, with no ancient industries and arts to boast of. Here again the Commission betrayed their inability to realize the peculiar conditions of India and could not understand that institutions and improvements which are an unmixed blessing in countries where they have spontaneously grown up in the gradual evolution from a previous state of things, or in countries where society is a *tabula rasa*, as it were, on which any superstructure can be raised without any destructive effect, may not be the same in a country like India where a social system has grown up during ages when railways as well as most appliances of the modern civilisation of the West were unknown. As a fact, wherever the railway penetrates in India, it carries destruction into the indigenous industries which have given the means of sustenance to the people and to which they have become accustomed during centuries. In no instance has this destructive effect of railways been proved to produce more lamentable results than in the weaving industry of India. This

industry is as old as Indian civilisation itself and the genius of the Hindus in displaying the highest excellence in its products has been admired by every foreign observer. "India," says Sir George Birdwood, "was probably the first of all countries that perfected weaving." In times gone by, India not only clothed all her people with her own cotton, but the European, including the small British, demand for cotton goods before the seventeenth century was met by importations from India itself. A very large proportion of the population have always lived upon the weaving trade. But this weaving trade has well-nigh become extinct. As Sir William Hunter says, "the tide of circumstances has compelled the Indian weaver to exchange his loom for the plough," thus adding largely to the heavy pressure of the population on land. Mr. J. S. Cotton says, "Lancashire has attained its pre-eminence by annihilating the indigenous industry—first by prohibitive duties and then by the competition of machinery." The extreme poverty of this large class of people is proved by the fact, so well known to famine administrators in India, that among the people that first feel the pressure of famine are the weavers, for whom special arrangements have always to be made in order that they may not become hopelessly scattered, and that, if perchance they survive the famine, they may remain in their places and continue to carry on their hereditary trade. What applies to the weaving industry applies to all indigenous industries. In fact every machine-made article imported from Europe and carried into the Indian village with the help of railways drives a nail in the coffin of a native industry, and in this manner the railways have to answer for a good deal of the poverty which makes the lot of the Indian poor so miserable. It may be said that the evil is inevitable and India is only going through the same experience that other countries went through in the period of transition when machinery replaced manual labour. This is true no doubt. But there is no particular reason why this inevitable evil should be aggravated and the work of the people's destruction made quicker and more complete by taxing the people themselves. Cannot the destructive process be made slower and more gradual so that the people may be given time to recover themselves? It is a great mistake that the Commission made in assuming that the Indian witnesses urged the complete stopping of all further construction. They never did any such thing. They recognise the material and moral good that railways do and the fact of their being indispensable in the carrying on of Government in modern days. They only pleaded for a more moderate progress which will not cause such large amounts to be borrowed in foreign markets from year to year.

The question of railway extension in India raises the other important question—where the required money should be borrowed, in London or at home. I have already referred to one weighty consideration in favour of the latter course. There are other reasons to which it is necessary to refer here. The result of borrowing in London has not been at all encouraging during the last quarter of a century.

Though the rates of interest have been reduced, still the rupee has so fallen in value that the saving from reduced rates of interest has been more than counterbalanced by the increase in the cost of exchange. The amount of interest on the sterling loans has grown during the last eighteen years from 2½ millions to nearly 3½ millions. Last year the Government resolved to borrow nearly 80 crores of rupees more for the construction of railways. Of these 80 crores about ten are to be borrowed in India, the rest being raised in London; and this will add another half-million sterling to the amount of interest. When the 20 crores are raised in London, the total amount of sterling loan will be 125 millions, roughly speaking. If the Government of India were to make up its mind to repay this whole loan, it would have to find nearly 17½ rupees for every pound sterling, that is to say, nearly 2,200 crores of rupees! But this impossible task the Government has no intention of trying. No provision is made in the Indian Budget for a sinking fund every year for the repayment of the foreign loan. So that the four millions paid as interest will be a perpetual yearly charge on the revenues of India. Nobody can maintain that such an unceasing drain is desirable. On the other hand, if all further growth of this charge can be stopped and all loans were raised in India, limiting the annual amount to what the Indian money market can safely supply, not only will the increasing drain be arrested, but the Indian capitalists will be benefited in proportion. The Government has estimated that about 5 crores of rupees can be annually borrowed in India; and to be on the safe side, and in order that the capital available for local industry and trade may not be encroached upon, we may put this figure at 3 crores. If to this amount a crore from the current revenues of the Government were added, it would give 4 crores every year for the extension of railway communication, and with this amount, whatever may be the consequence, the Government should rest content. During recent years Indian borrowing at home has been beneficial. The price of Rupee Paper has been steadily rising, and Government has been able to borrow at lower and lower rates. The 4 per cent. Rupee Paper was converted first into 3½ per cents. and subsequently to 3 per cents. Even if the Government has to pay a higher rate of interest in the Indian market than in the London market, it would be, for reasons already stated and for those which I shall briefly refer to below, more advantageous, on the whole, to borrow in the home market. Strangely, our financial authorities lose sight of the fact that the fall in the gold value of silver is exaggerated by the Secretary of State's offering for sale every year an increasing number of Bills in London. But the question should not be looked at from the point of view of Government's finance; it should be considered in respect of the results on the people of India. If the loans were raised in India instead of in London, the interest would be paid to people resident in India. Supposing ten crores of rupees were borrowed in India at 3 per cent., the interest paid to those that lent the money would be 30 lakhs a year, and along with all the benefits to the trade and industry and the

education of the people which would result from the railways built with the money thus borrowed, the 30 lakhs would remain in the country and fructify in the pockets of the people. Such a policy, steadily pursued by the Government, would be a great inducement to habits of economy and prudent investment among the people. If the 10 crores were not lent to Government, that money, or most of it, would have been spent in the households, in the making of ornaments, in marriage and other ceremonies, or in other more or less unproductive ways. But lent to the Government, it would yield an income of 30 lakhs a year, which would probably be spent in new productive investments.

THE POLICE AND THE GOVERNMENT.

"NO NECESSITY FOR ANY INTERFERENCE."

At the meeting of the Bengal Legislative Council on August 28 last the Hon. Surendra Nath Banerjee asked two important questions regarding the conduct of certain police officers in Calcutta.

The first question was: "I have the honour to call the attention of the Government to the statement noted in the margin, taken from a recent issue of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, which purports to describe a case of gross and unprovoked assault committed by Mr. Marklew, Inspector of the Sukea Street thana, upon Babu Girish Chunder Mukherjee, M.A., Head Assistant in the office of the Registrar of the Calcutta University.

"Is it the case, as alleged, that the Inspector assaulted Babu Girish Chunder Mukherjee, cutting his under lip, and gave orders to drag him to the thana, and that, although the Inspector was asked several times by the complainant what offence he had committed, the Inspector declined to give any answer? If so, will the Government be pleased to state what notice has been taken by the superior authorities of the conduct of the Inspector in the matter? Does the Government consider the Inspector a fit and proper person to remain in responsible charge of a station?"

The "statement noted in the margin" was as follows:

A police *sulum* of an unprecedented character was perpetrated at Machua Bazar Street this morning. At about 9.30 o'clock, when Babu Girish Chunder Mukherjee, M.A., Head Assistant to the Registrar of the Calcutta University, was about to leave for his office, he was arrested by a *posse* of constables, headed by Inspector Marklew, of Sukea Street thana, assaulted on the public road, and walked off to the thana. The head and front of Girish Babu's offence was that he had asked two police constables, who were beating a supposed thief and abusing him in the filthiest language on a piece of his land close to that part of his house especially intended for the ladies. Girish Babu objected to the violent language used by the constables within the hearing of the ladies, and told them to leave the place. One of the constables went and informed the Inspector of the local thana, and he immediately, with about a dozen constables and head-constables, came to Girish Babu's house, arrested him, and assaulted and took him to the thana in the manner I have mentioned above. He was charged with obstructing police officers in the discharge of their duties. He was afterwards released on bail.

AT THE POLICE COURT.

Later on the same day, Mr. Manuel, with several junior pleaders, appeared before Mr. Bonnaud, Officiating Northern

Division Presidency Magistrate, and applied on behalf of Babu Girish Chunder Mukherjee for a summons against Inspector Marklew of the Sukea Street thana and two of his subordinate police officers, for having trespassed into his client's house in Machua Bazar Street, and for having abused and assaulted him, dragged him along the streets to the local thana, although at the time no charge was made against him, and although the complainant's brother, Babu Gopal Chunder Mukherjee, Deputy Collector of Calcutta, desired to know what offence (if any) his brother had committed. It appears that early on Saturday a broken box, which was connected with a charge of theft, was found on an open piece of ground adjoining the complainant's house, and that some Indian police officers had taken two men to that piece of ground and were unmercifully beating them, on which the complainant, from an upper window, remonstrated with them. Thereupon, the complainant was called downstairs. On his coming downstairs, the subordinate officers at once laid their hands on him, and was dragging him to the thana, when Inspector Marklew came up with a *posse* of policemen, abused the complainant, and hit him a blow in the mouth, cutting his under-lip, and gave orders to drag him to the thana, and, although the Inspector was asked several times by the complainant and his brother and several other respectable neighbours, to state what offence he had committed, the Inspector declined to give any reason. As far as the complainant was aware, he was arrested without any justification whatever. In the scuffle he was so flurried that he dropped his spectacles, so that when a document was handed to him and he signed it, he did not know a word of its contents. After recording some evidence his worship granted summonses against Inspector Marklew and his subordinates.

The Hon. Mr. Bolton gave the following answer to the first question:—

"The Lieutenant-Governor's attention was attracted by the case mentioned by the hon. member, and an enquiry has been made. The Commissioner of Police reports that the Inspector did not assault Babu Girish Chandra Mukherji. It appears that two thieves were taken by some police officers to an open plot of land adjoining that person's house and belonging to him, for the purpose of pointing out stolen property hidden there. Babu Girish Chandra Mukherji objected to the noise which was made, and told the police to leave, pushing or assaulting one of them. He was thereupon arrested by another officer for assault on the police, but broke away. Information was conveyed to Inspector Marklew, who came and re-arrested the Babu at his door, after enquiring whether it was he who had assaulted the police officer and receiving the answer that he had committed no assault, but had got away from the custody of the police. The Inspector did not exceed his powers under the law, but the Lieutenant-Governor is not satisfied that his action was throughout judicious. He is an officer of fourteen years' service, who is reported by the Commissioner of Police to bear an excellent character and to be quite fit for the charge of a station. The case instituted by the police, as well as the complaint filed against them by Babu Girish Chandra Mukherji has been amicably settled."

Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee's second question was: "I beg to ask if the attention of the Government had been called to the allegations set forth in the margin, and which are quoted from one of the newspapers.

"(a) Is it the case that Mr. Lyons, Inspector of the Ekbalpur thana, was fined five rupees by Mr. Wheeler, Joint Magistrate of Alipore, for committing an assault upon one, Jack Blackford, while he was in police custody, causing him to bleed, for no other offence than that he had complained to the Inspector of violent treatment at the hands of the constables in whose custody he was?"

"(b) Is it the case that the Deputy Magistrate before whom Blackford complained called for a report from his immediate superior officer, Mr. Forsyth, the superintendent, and that upon such report, and after such enquiry as the Deputy Magistrate made, he declined to issue process?"

"(c) Is it the case that the District Judge before whom an appeal was made against the orders of the Deputy Magistrate characterised the assault committed upon Blackford as 'perfectly unjustifiable,' and directed process to issue against the police inspector, and the case having been made over by the Judge to a Magistrate other than the Deputy Magistrate who had heard the complaint, viz., Mr. Wheeler, the Joint Magistrate of Alipore, the said Joint Magistrate fined the Inspector five rupees, notwithstanding the evidence of Mr. Forsyth, the Superintendent, to the contrary?"

"(d) Will the Government be pleased to state what notice has been taken of the conduct of the Inspector who was convicted by a Judicial Court of assault committed upon a person in his custody?"

The "allegations set forth in the margin" were these:

Another officer of the same (Calcutta Police) force, Mr. Lyons, has, we observe, been fined by Mr. Wheeler, Joint-Magistrate of Alipore, for assaulting a young Eurasian while in police custody. This case has a history of its own well worth reproduction. One night in March last, Mr. Lyons, then in charge of the Ekbalpur thana, received information that some people were having a row in a house close by, occupied by an East Indian family, and he at once started with a couple of dozen constables, as if he was going to put down a riot. Arrived at the house, he found that those whom he wanted had gone away, and an inoffensive young man, Jack Blackford, was the sole occupant of the premises. Against him there was no information before him, and it was abundantly clear that he was not one of the party which was indulging in liquor, and yet Lyons had him arrested, and to cap all, struck him with his fist, causing him to bleed, simply because he had the impudence to complain of the ill-treatment he had received from the constables in whose custody he was. The arrest and the assault, according to the Sessions Judge, before whom the matter went on revision "were perfectly unjustifiable"; but how did the Magistrate dispose of Blackford's complaint when he went to Court? Maulvi Abdul Kader, who first took judicial cognisance of the matter, declined to issue a process upon the European Inspector, but wanted a police report first. In vain did Blackford protest against Superintendent Forsyth—the *alter ego* of the Inspector—having anything to do with his complaint; but the Magistrate, whose sole aim was to stand well with the police and be a *persona grata* with the Commissioner of Police, was inexorable. Mr. Forsyth's report, as was anticipated, was adverse to the complainant, and then the Magistrate held an elaborate enquiry, during which Mr. Forsyth represented the accused with the result that the complaint was dismissed under section 203, Criminal Procedure Code. Mr. Lyons was deemed too big a swell to be summoned as an accused and placed on the dock. Discomfited before the Magistrate, poor Blackford had to approach the Sessions Judge, who, fortunately for him, at once saw the injustice of the Magistrate's order, and directed process to issue against the Inspector. The Judge would not trust the Maulvi with the re-trial of the case, and it was, therefore, made over to Mr. Wheeler, who found, in spite of Mr. Forsyth's evidence to the contrary, that Blackford's version of the assault was substantially correct. For full five months this man had to run from Court to Court to seek that justice, which came tardily in the end.

The Hon. Mr. Bolton gave the following answer to the second question:—

"The Lieutenant-Governor has perused papers relating to the case referred to. It is true that the inspector was fined by the Joint-Magistrate, as stated, that the Deputy-Magistrate had previously refused to issue process against him, and that the Judge ordered the hearing of the complaint, believing from the evidence before him that an assault had been committed by the Inspector. On full consideration of the circumstances of the case, the Lieutenant-Governor sees no necessity for any interference on the part of the Government."

OUR WEEKLY ISSUE, 1898.

The first number of the weekly INDIA will be issued on Friday, January 7, 1898.

It is proposed in the first instance to publish each week a paper of 16 large foolscap pages.

That is to say, subscribers will receive in the course of the year more than twice the number of pages which they now receive.

It is not, however, proposed to increase the Indian subscription, which will remain at 6 RUPEES per annum, prepaid, including postage.

The subscription in the United Kingdom will be 9 SHILLINGS per annum, prepaid, including postage.

As regards the contents of the journal, it is proposed to continue in somewhat abbreviated form the Notes on Indian Affairs which have hitherto appeared under the heading "Indiana."

In addition to unsigned editorial articles on current Indian topics, it is proposed to print from time to time Signed Articles by acknowledged experts.

A full report of Parliamentary proceedings relating to India will continue to be printed, and it is hoped that questions put and answers given on THURSDAY AFTERNOON may be fully reported in the issue of the following day.

In addition to news, articles and notes relating specially to Indian topics, it is proposed, in accordance with the suggestion of many readers, to publish regularly a careful CHRONICLE of the most important events at home and abroad.

It is also proposed to publish weekly during the Session a PARLIAMENTARY SKETCH from a Special Correspondent in the Gallery.

Efforts will be made to give prompt and exact information regarding the arrival and departure of Indians, and such other PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE as is likely to be of interest to Indian readers.

Special attention will be given to articles upon Indian affairs which appear in British NEWS-PAPERS, MAGAZINES, and REVIEWS.

The Indian and Anglo-Indian journals which come to hand by the mail on Monday or Tuesday will at once be searched, and matters of interest contained in them, or in the letters of INDIA'S own correspondents, will be dealt with in the issue of the following Friday.

Prompt reviews of books and of official publications relating to India will be published, and every effort will be made to deal promptly with official and other publications forwarded from India.

The work of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress will be regularly chronicled, and reports will be given, so far as space permits, of meetings at which Indian topics are discussed.

In these and in other ways INDIA, possessing the advantages of more frequent publication, will endeavour to discharge faithfully its twofold function, (i) as a medium of communication between the United Kingdom and India, and (ii) as a source of information for English readers in Indian affairs.

The Editor will be glad at all times to receive and consider suggestions.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward list of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1897.

THE SILENCE OF SIR H. FOWLER.

"I believe there is nothing on which Liberals ought to set their hearts more firmly than resistance—strong resistance—to what is called the 'forward' policy in India."—*Mr. John Morley* at Forfar, October 4.

"I trust that at any rate these troubles will have one good result—that they may lead to the reconsideration, and that at no distant time, of the lines upon which our Indian frontier policy has for the past twenty years been carried on."—*Mr. Asquith* at Ladybank, September 30.

We asked last month, Where are the Liberal leaders? Mr. John Morley and Mr. Asquith leave no doubt as to the answer. They are, and plainly intend to remain, well to the fore in the work of overthrowing the mad policy of which the present war beyond the Indian frontier is but the latest, and not the worst, result. While Sir George White, in the exhilarating atmosphere of the United Service Club at Simla, has been talking transparent cant about "England's great and beautiful civilising 'mission in the East'—the mission, that is, of educating mid-Asia partly by means of broken pledges, and partly by means of machine-guns—and Lord Napier of Magdala, in the friendly columns of the *Times*, has been advocating further advance as a preventive of fever among our troops, Mr. Morley and Mr. Asquith have told the truth in words understood of the people, and formulated the policy of the Liberal party in terms which cannot be misin-

terpreted and will not be forgotten. Their speeches, which are recorded in another part of our present issue, are admirable. But they are not better than the correspondence between Lord Northbrook, Mr. Morley, and Lord George Hamilton, which—for the present at any rate—leaves the Secretary of State for India to meditate upon "decidedly one of the 'most foolish Parliamentary smiles to be found in 'all 'Hansard'."

It is not only Mr. Morley and Mr. Asquith who have said what they ought to have said. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Adlam, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Mr. George Russell, Mr. Schwann, Mr. Philip Stanhope, Mr. Herbert Paul, and many other prominent Liberals have during the past month turned the "forward" policy inside out and upside down. Mr. Paul, for example, said at Manchester on October 22—and his words were applauded—that if this policy were persisted in India must become bankrupt, and the English taxpayer would have to come to her relief. So, too, it is this subject which is the chief bone of contention in the bye-election in the Middleton division, where the cotton duties have brought home to men's business and bosoms the question of Indian military expenditure. All this is very much to the good. But where, in this chorus of voices, is Sir Henry Fowler? If Parliament were sitting, there would be no difficulty as to the answer. We should know that he was conversing with Lord George Hamilton behind the Speaker's chair. It is little short of a scandal that Sir H. Fowler as ex-Secretary for India has not yet come forward in the present discussion to denounce the reversal of the policy of the late Liberal Cabinet.

Sir H. Fowler's silence is, we fear, characteristic. Let us not forget that he has done his best on more than one occasion to prevent effective discussion upon the general question in the House of Commons, and that his evasive answers in March, April and May, 1895, gave rise to much misgiving among independent Liberals. As we wrote in INDIA for November of that year:—

Candour compels us to add that, although Lord Rosebery's Government came to the right decision in the end, they took an unconscionably long time to make up their minds. They discouraged and evaded the attempts of the Indian Parliamentary Committee to obtain information in the House of Commons, and by their failure to make that information public, they paved the way for an easy reversal of their decision at the hands of their successors.

It is well to remind ourselves of these points because they make clear the impossibility of Sir Henry Fowler's returning to the India Office in any future Liberal Government. As for the righteous indignation which is now being lavished upon Mr. Morley and Mr. Asquith for what the *Times* is pleased to call their "attack upon Lord Elgin," let us remember that the *Times* and some of its colleagues in the Tory press never proposed to observe the Chitral proclamation at all. The proclamation was published in the *Times* of March 20, 1895. In a leading article on March 26 the *Times* said: "We want a road, neither more nor less. . . . We may expect with some confidence that a valuable and indispensable right of way will be permanently 'assured.'" That puts the *Times* out of court.

"PLAUDITE!"

THE Mansion House Famine Relief Fund, in strange contrast with its reluctant opening, was formally closed with a cheerful alacrity at a meeting in the Mansion House on October 7 last. There was present on the platform the customary galaxy of official personages and civic dignitaries, and there was in evidence the usual incorrigible optimism of our Indian administrators. The speeches were laden with the usual compliments of officials by officials. Nor was self-praise lacking in this truly civic banquet of laudation and congratulation. To change the metaphor, the play was over and before the well-graced actors retired from the stage they bade the audience, "Plaudite." In the Lord Mayor's glad recital of the fact that the fund had broken all previous records, one seemed to detect the gratified introspection of London's Chief Magistrate. I am a great Lord Mayor, he seemed to say. See how I have managed this fund. My energy is unsurpassable. I have deserved well of India and of my country. And Lord George Hamilton in feebler tone took up the strain. The Government of India, he said in effect, has carried through this vast enterprise with rare skill and devotion. I myself form no small part of the Government of India. My cool restraining judgment, my critical assay of all the conditions, my sober estimate of the needs of India, were invaluable at the start. The decent hesitation which I decreed added incalculable lustre to the fund when I finally gave permission for it to go forward. And now see how careful I am of the pecuniary interests of persons charitably disposed. It is true that the famine is not over yet: but still with economy we may pull through. Not one day longer than I can help it shall the fund remain open. Let it then be closed, but let us first thank each other for the conspicuous parts we have played in the matter and for the success which has crowned our efforts. Thus the Secretary of State mingled his official treble with the deep, full-bodied bass of the prosperous civic magnate. An exhilarating performance, to be sure! Yet whatever may have been the tone of these two protagonists, the Mansion House Fund has not been altogether unworthy. The total sum raised by the parent fund was £549,300. There are still a few hundreds to come in, so that it is not unreasonable to assume that the final total will reach £550,000. The cost of administering the fund in London was £6,768 or 1½ per cent. But of this nearly £6,000 were spent in advertisements—so necessary in all such appeals—and as the contributions from the proprietors of newspapers practically returned this amount in donations, it is not unfair to say that out of every pound subscribed by the public no less than 19s. 11½d. was sent to India. That is satisfactory and matter for moderate and reasonable gratification. In addition to the Mansion House Fund proper Lancashire and other parts of the Empire contributed directly to the Central Relief Committee at Calcutta—the contribution of Lancashire alone, whose generosity on such occasions is proverbial, amounting to £158,000. The grand total, therefore,

received in Calcutta amounted to Rs1,65,00,000 or roughly over £1,000,000. This also is satisfactory and one need not follow Lord George Hamilton into his rather puerile calculations that 35 lakhs more were contributed in kind. There was at the meeting a sort of rivalry between the Secretary of State and the Lord Mayor as to who could make the fund the bigger. The Lord Mayor said a million in all, but Lord George Hamilton, capping the total with the somewhat hypothetical 35 lakhs, put in a claim for two crores or nearly £1,500,000. It does not make pleasant reading, this rather vulgar contest in big talk about the fund. For all practical purposes one may take it that a million was subscribed in one way or another—a sum which, if one considers all the circumstances, is matter for quiet approval, but certainly not for bombast.

Another point in the Secretary of State's deliverance does not surprise us in the least. It will be remembered that when the whole London press—especially the *Daily Chronicle*—was criticising with severity the delay in opening the fund, the officials at the India Office were bidding the people be calm, and denouncing the wild exaggerations of ignorant busy-bodies. The famine "threatened" to be extensive, they admitted. But it might not come, after all. Besides, in any case, it would not be "intense." It was a gross abuse of the power of the press to allege that we were face to face with the greatest famine of the century. Let all men trust the officials; they had their hands on the threatened visitation, they knew their work, and would ask for charitable aid in good time. To-day what do we hear? The famine has been "the most serious of which the century has record." We quote from the *Times* report of Lord George Hamilton's speech. Officials, it would seem, tend to be all alike. While it suited the theories of the India Office the famine was a "scarcity." Now, when it suits its views to recognise the opposite, the famine is the greatest famine of the century. At the first, any amount of belittling, of minimising to cover official unpreparedness, to comply with official red tape, and to conform to official notions of deliberate procedure. When all is over, magnification to the utmost, not without glorification of Government for "the manner in which the famine has been combated in India." It is to be presumed that, when the time comes, this ampler estimate will serve to belittle and minimise by comparison the next great famine upon its approach—and so on, in a never-ending vicious circle of official evasion and wordy opportunism. "My estimate [of the number of persons needing relief] was considerably exceeded," says Lord George Hamilton, with something like a simper. Of course it was. Most of us perceived at the time that Lord George Hamilton's estimate was nothing more than a statement based on the official conception of what ought to be the course pursued, rather than upon the real and full facts of the situation. In the middle of June there were no fewer than 4½ millions on relief—at the time, that is, when the officials were talking of "privation," "starvation" being too rude and rough a word for official lips to utter. Even to-day, when the fund is closed amid salvos of mutual applause, there are something like a

million and a-half unfortunates reduced to the necessity of working on relief works. But there is something more serious than that. It is admitted by the Secretary of State that in the Central Provinces a state of acute famine will continue until "well on into the ensuing calendar year," which is a long way of saying that there will be another six months of famine in the Central Provinces. And yet the Secretary of State thinks "we may congratulate ourselves on the manner in which the famine has been combated in India." Our readers will doubtless be reminded of the passages from the Anglo-Indian press which we quoted in our last issue. Even the *Times of India* regretted that the Secretary of State was in "such good humour" in his Budget speech. The writer added that there was "no danger lest a too optimistic construction should be placed in India upon the Secretary of State's account of the situation."

Lord George Hamilton tells us something about the cost of the famine to the Government of India. Doubtless his estimate is conceived upon the same liberal scale as that upon which he constructed his fanciful total of the Relief Fund. The Government of India will have a big deficit on the next Budget, and it is much better to attribute financial misfortune—now that exchange is so perverse as to be continually better than the estimate—to famine, which the Government of India can call the act of God, than to frontier wars, which are too obviously the act of the Government. With this caution, we reproduce Lord G. Hamilton's estimate:—

	Rx.
To Direct Relief	6,000,000
„ Remissions of taxation	6,000,000
„ Advances to cultivators	2,000,000
TOTAL	Rx. 14,000,000

The only other point to notice in regard to this estimate is the claim that the Government have "remitted" six crores of money due from the taxpayers. One would like to have the details. Was it all cash remitted? And has it been "remitted" or only "suspended"? But this is, at best, only an estimate of cost in money. What has been the cost in human lives? Upon this point—incomparably the most important point in the whole matter—Lord George Hamilton is decorously silent. He refrains from words even of good omen. There has been heavy mortality in some districts—but then there are always outbreaks of disease in the train of every famine. True. But the name of the chief disease is Death by Starvation. What is the number of deaths by starvation that represents the true cost of the present famine? That and that alone is the test of how the famine "has been combated in India"—that and that alone is the true criterion of success. We have contended all along that it was the duty of the authorities to keep the British public and the public in India informed of the course of the famine by the periodic publication of clear and intelligible bills of mortality. How have they performed this obvious duty? Perfunctorily and unintelligently. People have died by hundreds

of thousands—but not of "starvation." Epidemics, fevers, "privation,"—that blessed word—have been the causes of death in official returns. Now that the famine is to be officially treated as a thing of the past, we renew our demand for light on this point. We desire to be informed by means of precise comparative tables, and through the medium of the best statistical information at the disposal of the Government of India, what has been the excess mortality reasonably attributable to the famine, or—if the phrase be preferred—to the inadequacy of efforts to cope with the "scarcity" which has prevailed. When one knows this, and knows that the mortality has not been very great, then and not till then one will know also whether it is suitable to congratulate the Government on "the manner in which the famine has been combated in India."

THE ENGLISH PROSE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.¹

To pass judgement on the prose of the nineteenth century whilst it still has an appreciable, if rapidly disappearing, portion of its life's course to run, may seem to savour of indecent haste. Let the Diamond Jubilee, which has turned all our thoughts to retrospect, serve for one excuse; the completion of Mr. Craik's useful selections of English Prose may serve for another. Living writers are excluded from Mr. Craik's plan; yet since Walter Pater and R. L. Stevenson have passed, all too soon, to the majority, there can be no doubt that, with one great but solitary exception, he has had at his disposal all the prose of the first quality that the century has produced. The one exception is, of course, the prose of Mr. Ruskin; and since "Praeterita" was broken off unfinished some years ago, Mr. Ruskin has written nothing. We live in a curious literary interregnum, both in prose and poetry:

The epoch ends, the world is still,
The age has talk'd and work'd its fill,
The famous orators have shone,
The famous poets sung and gone.

If any great and arresting voice should claim a hearing in the next year or two, it will belong not to the nineteenth century but to the twentieth, just as the famous volume of "Lyrical Ballads," published in 1798, belonged not to the last century but to this. Already we seem to hear the new age, in its favourite newspapers, "carolling and shouting, over "tombs, amid graves."

Sculptors like Phidias,
Raphael in shoals,
Poets like Shakespeare—
Beautiful souls!

But those who feel the spell of the past are tempted to be a little slow in responding to these clamorous appeals for admiration. They do not like to break the charm of the twilight hour; their eyes are fixed on "the one or two immortal lights" that—

Rise slowly up into the sky
To shine there everlastingly,
Like stars over the bounding hill.

¹ "English Prose Selections." Edited by Henry Craik. Vol. 5, Nineteenth Century. (London: Macmillan.)

Mr. Craik's bulky fifth volume is not confined to "the one or two immortal lights;" it contains specimens of the work of no fewer than forty-six prose writers. Nor is there any need to carp at the inclusion of so large a number. They cannot all be immortal; but perhaps there is no one here who does not deserve to be held in remembrance for some time to come. Of course, every such collection must have its surprise, and Mr. Craik's surprise—he bears himself the full responsibility, for he is the writer of the critical appreciation, and the tone of it is curiously defiant—is Lord Beaconsfield. Few would cavil at Lord Beaconsfield's inclusion; but fewer still would be prepared to accord him the space allotted by Mr. Craik. Nor does the appeal twice made to Mr. Froude's authority strengthen the editor's case. Mr. Froude, despite his own great literary gifts, was never remarkable for critical judgement; his own style had weaknesses akin to the more glaring vices of Lord Beaconsfield's; and he was notoriously biased by political partisanship. The first sentence of one of the examples of Disraeli's writing here printed runs as follows: "It is proverbial to what drowning men will cling." After which, anyone with an ear sensitive to the requirements of English prose is tempted to turn the page, and thereby to draw down upon himself the scathing strictures of Mr. Craik. Of course, it is unfair to judge by a first sentence, even by the first sentence of a specimen presumably chosen for excellence of style; yet it would scarcely be unreasonable to say that no man who wrote such a first sentence as this could take high rank as a writer of English prose. For though "matter" should count for more than "manner" in our estimation of literature, both are indispensable: it is only when the "matter" takes on a certain "manner" that it becomes literature at all, and the "manner" of the sentence quoted above must be described as execrable. On the whole, however, Mr. Craik has performed his task with conspicuous ability. The introductions are the really valuable part of the book. It is neither profitable nor pleasurable, as a rule, to read prose writers in selections whose average length is a couple of pages, the novelists especially suffering from this mode of representation. But the critical estimates by the editor himself, by Mr. George Saintsbury, Mr. W. P. Ker, and others, are most acceptable contributions towards the literary history of the century. More than that, they are contributions, in the critical aphorisms that lie scattered up and down them, to that sound body of literary criticism that has still to be formed. Thoroughly deserving of study, for instance, is the editor's dictum that "false ornament" is, on the whole, a better and more healthy sign "than no ornament at all; a prose style which moves too timidly, and fears all that is gorgeous lest it become tawdry, and all that is strenuous lest it become exaggerated, soon becomes afraid of its own shadow, and ceases to move at all" (p. 7); or Mr. Saintsbury's, that the sentiment of enthusiasm, "though at a first perusal it may be a fallible and even a rather suspicious guide, is the surest test of literary excellence when it renews itself at each fresh reading after or through a long course of years" (p. 379); or Mr. Ker's observation that

"Macaulay's weak places are those in which his memory fails to make up for the want of a philosophy" (p. 416); or Mr. Raleigh's criticism of the limitations of Charlotte Brontë, that "there is too much that does not interest her, and that she does not understand, in the world at large, to allow of her dealing happily with the supernumeraries" (p. 627).

The great characteristic of the prose of the century as defined by the editor in his general introduction, is not *development* but *variety*. The talk we sometimes hear about "raising English to a new power" comes chiefly from those who know nothing of the history of English prose. To read the prose of Milton and Dryden, or of the Elizabethans, is to learn a lesson in humility. A man who has their great sentences ringing in his ears will not lightly boast himself better than his fathers. But the wonderful and manifold advance of knowledge has made new demands upon speech; and speech has not been slow to respond to those demands. "It has bent itself to the needs of a restless age, and has acquired elasticity thereby."

A careful survey of the best writing of the century will probably impress upon the student these two principles, at first sight, but only at first sight, opposed to each other. First, that a good style is not attained without much labour. Secondly, that a cardinal requisite of a good style is absolute sincerity. We have all heard how R. L. Stevenson "played the sedulous ape" to each of the great masters in turn, and of the "travail and agony," and "toil as at a deep petroleum well when the oil refuses to flow," of Pater's method of composition. But such labour is no new thing. Carlyle, with all his contempt for the mere art of words, toiled incessantly; Macaulay, though his marvellous memory supplied him with inexhaustible material, worked at the writing of his history with the most unrelenting conscientiousness. We are not accustomed to think of Thackeray as industrious; but if he was not, he must be the only great writer of the century whose words have arranged themselves on paper in the fit and natural order, without any effort on his part. For it is not an easy, but a very difficult thing, to write naturally—as most men know who have tried. We try to set down our thoughts, and lo! instead of a pleasant cadence, disagreeable assonances, harsh combinations of jarring consonants. Yet the literary successes and failures of the century alike convey the lesson that sincerity is the first thing. The writers who will live are those who have had something to say, and been tremendously in earnest about saying it. De Quincey, for instance, who cared far more about manner than about matter, and who achieved high distinction by his experiments in "impassioned prose," is by this time unmistakably falling into the second rank: the matter is hardly weighty enough to carry the manner to the proud immortality that used to be predicted for him. With Carlyle, with Macaulay, with Ruskin, each in his own way, the toil was not to achieve a style, to find some superlatively fine manner of saying things, but to find adequate expression for the thought that was in him. Mere imitation of style is apt to lead only to gruesome parody; as was shown the other

day by the popular novelist who wrote a preface, or, as he preferred to call it, a "foreword" to some early essays of Carlyle, and described his hero as "him of the burning stomach and the honest, forth-looking, irascible eyes." How could he write such fustian, one wonders, without hearing the indignant voice of Carlyle thundering its remonstrance from the pages of *Past and Present*; and bidding him "cease to be a hollow sounding-shell of hearsays, egoisms, purblind dilettantisms, and become, were it on the infinitely small scale, a faithful discerning soul." This is the counsel that all the great writers would give us, if we could ask their guidance.

"DISGRACE AND DISASTER."

Sir Lepel Griffin, who will not be suspected of bias in favour of the National Congress or of Radicalism, has raised his voice in the October number of the *Nineteenth Century* in strong condemnation of the "Forward" policy. According to Sir Lepel, this policy has utterly broken down; it "has culminated in both disgrace and disaster." The censure is thoroughly well deserved, and the weight of it is all the greater as coming from such a quarter. Apologists of the Government policy have attempted to minimise the loss of the border posts, such as Ali Masjid and Lundi Kotal. They have told the British public that, after all, these were "not British forts, but Afridi wayside halting-places, held by the Afridis themselves, with regard to which the British Government was precluded from any responsibility." Sir Lepel has no difficulty or hesitation in sweeping away such plausible and disingenuous cobwebs, and he goes to the point of substance at once.

"The Khyber, from end to end," he points out, "whatever agreements may say, was in charge of British officers, its police paid from the Peshawar treasury, and was virtually British territory, and to have allowed its posts to be captured and burned shows that the responsible authorities were unprepared and badly informed. No such disgrace has before befallen us in the whole history of the frontier."

Sir Lepel hits the nail on the head and drives it home. The disgrace is patent, and with it is involved disaster. But the main element of disaster really lies on the financial side of the business.

"The radical evil is that, the Commander-in-Chief having behind him the Treasury of the Government of India, military expeditions are conducted on the most extravagant scale, every regiment in the regular army is eager to join in the rush for distinction and service, and an army is collected, as now, of 60,000 men, sufficient to repel the attack of a European Power. Either the Government are aware that their irritating measures of interference have excited a general and concerted rising of all the frontier tribes, or the present preparations are out of all reasonable proportion to the difficulty. But when the Commander-in-Chief, who knows as little of the frontier tribes as the Viceroy, demands an army, the Government at Calcutta, having no local knowledge behind them which is not eager to spend money rather than save it, is powerless to make a stand for economy."

There is another cause of the immense cost of recent expeditions, and that is "the vicious system of scattering military posts over independent territory far from support, like those in Chitral, Kuram, and Samana."

"In time of peace these posts are useless for all purposes of

civilisation; they waste valuable troops required elsewhere, and are a cause of chronic irritation and discontent. In time of war they require an army to relieve them."

So, what with military ambitions and political folly, the money goes disastrously. And on this point, Sir Lepel Griffin confirms in the strongest manner the broad principles of administration that some of us have been steadily inculcating for years. Thus:

"To lighten taxation, to develop the industrial resources of the country, to render the people prosperous and content, to relieve them from dread and danger of famine, to feed and clothe them better, to give them cheap and speedy justice—these are the aims which an enlightened Administration must endeavour to attain. No spirited frontier policy which is pursued by the sacrifice of these beneficent objects can be called successful, and the Government and the English people will have to decide which of the two they will choose. They certainly cannot have both."

A very Daniel come to judgement! The disastrous character of the "Forward" Policy can hardly be stated more strongly than in Sir Lepel's unqualified assertion that "unless it be speedily reversed it will lead India to bankruptcy."

With regard to the cause of the outbreak Sir Lepel is in no doubt whatever. It is not incitement from Constantinople. Condemnation of the Sultan by English speakers and writers "has undoubtedly excited great and legitimate disgust and irritation among Indian Muhammadans who regard him with respect as the ruler of Turkey and the chief representative of Islam." But—

"But beyond our border, among the independent tribes, I do not believe that the influences from Constantinople, which to some extent affect Indian Muhammadans, have any practical force. I have never seen any evidence of this on the frontier; and the late Akhund of Swat . . . had twenty times more influence with the tribes than any Sultan at Constantinople."

Sir Lepel agrees exactly on this point with Dr. Leitner. He also comes to the same conclusion with regard to the Amir. "There is every presumption in favour of the Amir's good faith, and no public evidence against him."

"My own belief is that, in the splendid isolation in which it seems to delight English statesmen to reside, His Highness the Amir of Kabul is about the most trustworthy ally that we possess in Europe or Asia."

What, then, is the matter? This:

"While those who are responsible for the policy in question are endeavouring in every way to shift the blame from their own shoulders to those of the Sultan or the Amir, it seems unreasonable and unnecessary to seek for obscure and recondite causes for the hostility of the tribes when there is an amply sufficient reason in their belief that the forward policy of the Government endangers, or is directed against, their immemorial independence."

Again, Sir Lepel is in thorough accord with our own view. Now, as to the future? Well, what ought not to be done is tolerably patent; although, probably enough, it will be tried.

"Suppose, for example, that the advisers of the Viceroy, who persuaded him to sanction the military road to Chitral, should insist as a condition of Afridi submission on their disarmament, or on the future maintenance of a similar road through the Afridi country to their summer headquarters in Tirah. Judging by past experience and present suggestion, it is probable enough that such proposals may be pressed upon the Viceroy. yet all experts in frontier administration will agree that no more foolish measures could be adopted, or more fatal to the chance of future tranquillity."

Even the *Spectator*, we regret to observe, calmly contemplates, not merely roads, but even the establishment and maintenance of a post or posts in the Afridi country. When the decision comes to be taken, we trust that the officers of the Indian army from the Commander-in-Chief downwards, will be treated as Sir Lepel prescribes: "their opinion should neither be asked nor taken." No doubt, we shall be officially told that the tribesmen are all dying for love of us, and will never be happy till they get us to make a road or a fort in their territory; and we shall have the charge of a breach of faith bandied about once more. With all respect to Lord Northbrook, we cannot but think he is grasping the husk and missing the kernel, in his criticism of Mr. Morley and Mr. Asquith. We agree unreservedly with Sir Lepel Griffin:

"If a military road, supported by military posts, and held by tribal levies paid from the British treasury, is made and maintained in independent territory, that will be considered by the tribes to be occupation, whatever any apologist may say, and it is difficult to assert that they are wrong."

Looking at the positive side of the question, Sir Lepel Griffin only indicates his view, reserving full exposition for another occasion. He thinks "it is impossible to restore the past system, giving back the Frontier Force to the local Government, and allowing it the effective control of all trans-border affairs." He, therefore, falls back upon Lord Lytton's premature proposal, to place the frontier districts under a Chief Commissioner. No doubt the growing complexity of the work of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab is a strong argument; yet, on the other hand, there seems danger in having a special Commissioner in charge of the frontier. Such an officer would be tempted to make himself work. True, Sir Lepel firmly bargains that this official shall be a civilian, and on no account, as Lord Lytton proposed, a military man.

"What is needed is a strong civil administrator whose professional instinct would be in favour of peace and not of war, and who would be content to follow the firm and friendly policy towards the tribes which was pursued with success by Lieutenant-Governors of the Punjab: Lord Lawrence, Sir Robert Montgomery, Sir Donald McLeod, Sir Henry Durand, Sir Henry Davies, and Sir Robert Egerton. He would be the full receptacle of local knowledge, on which the Viceroy and the Foreign Office could safely draw, instead of, as at present, remaining the unconscious instruments of a military clique which is most unwisely endeavouring to deal with the country beyond our border as Russia dealt with Circassia. For in the armed independence of the frontier tribes is one of the surest defences of India."

Anyhow, we shall look with interest for the full exposition of these ideas; and, meantime, we record our satisfaction with the main lines of the present powerful and most opportune article.

The Queen has been graciously pleased to approve the reappointment to the Council of India, for a further period of five years, of Sir James Braithwaite Peile, K.C.S.I., whose present tenure of the office expires on November 12, 1897.

The Queen has been graciously pleased to approve the reappointment to the Council of India, for a further period of five years, of Sir Alfred Comyns Lyall, G.C.I.E., K.C.B., whose present tenure of the office expires on January 17, 1898.

THINGS OF INDIA: SEEN—AND NOT SEEN.

THE Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure has, in course of its protracted sittings, touched several other points of the Indian problem besides dealing with that large subject, one which any man, who cares to try, can understand. Amongst certain obscure points and side issues that have cropped up in course of the evidence or conversations between the Commissioners and their examinees is that large and difficult one as to the total annual income of India as a whole, and its relation to the poverty or prosperity of its population—more especially the four-fifths thereof under direct British administration. This subject appears to have been dealt with chiefly by one of the Commissioners, Sir James B. Peile, who, at various stages, undertook the duty of closely cross-examining the Indian witnesses thereon. One typical instance of this sort occurred in the examination of Prof. G. K. Gokhale, last April. That Commissioner, who is a prominent member of the India Council and a retired Bombay Civilian of much experience, was the chief speaker in the course of this crucial passage. After giving his own concise summary of the increased production and rise in prices of agricultural products during the modern period, more especially as following on railway extension, he sought to bring the question to practical test by citing the large importations of the precious metals by India during the last two or three decades. He took as one substantial fact to go upon, a table by the Bank of Bengal (why not from the India Office's own statistics?) showing that on the thirty-three years ending with March, 1892, India had received and retained 356½ millions of bullion (rather less than one-third of which was gold), being equal to 10½ millions annual average.¹ Thereupon Sir James put, as if admitting of but one answer, the question: "Are not these facts that I have mentioned signs of decreasing rather than of increasing poverty?" and the noble Chairman further emphasised this by his interrogative remark: "The fact of these large amounts pouring into India shows that India as a whole was not decreasing in wealth?"

Now these passages are an apt statement of "what is seen" in this matter. They fairly represent the popular and superficial view of this special factor in India's commercial finance. To the evident surprise of these weighty men, the Indian witness replied, "I do not think so." On being pressed, he pointed out the considerations that lie immediately under the surface of these apparently large imports of treasure, remarking first, they were not "very large sums when you remember what a large country India is." Here let us take this simple arithmetical test, which the Indian witness had not opportunity to apply at the time. Taking the whole population at 300 millions (287 in 1891), that enormous aggregate only gives a fraction over five annas (5·76), say *ninence* per annum per head. Surely there is in this statistic no striking display of "prosperity" or "wealth," even of the metallic sort. Granted: this is "seen," and it is real; but this true figure leaves an impression very different from the bald statement of the huge aggregate total. And this average is only on the surface. So let us follow the Indian witness as he brought out other considerations "not seen" at once, even by the two Commissioners. In citing Professor Gokhale's explanations regarding the Chairman's "large amounts pouring into India", it will be sufficient to summarise them thus:—This as a question of poverty and prosperity relates only to British India, so we have to ascertain what proportion

¹ It must be remembered that these thirty-three years included several years following the Mutiny, when the Home drafts being nearly suspended, treasure flowed in—mainly proceeds of looms—also the years of dear cottons, when the imports of treasure were enormous and abnormal.

of these large amounts of treasure are absorbed by the Native States—then, as the question relates to the economic condition of the populations under, and as affected by British administration, we require to trace what are the classes into whose hands flow the chief portion of these "large amounts"; it is not only possible, but almost obvious, that while a small percentage of the population, say from five to ten per cent., get very much more than the small share *per capita*, the annual share of these precious metals distributed amongst eighty per cent. of the population—cultivators, artisans and labourers—would have to be reckoned in annas, not rupees; not in silver, but in copper. (That is so, as shown above.)

This brief analysis, as indicated by the Indian witness, of Sir James Peile's imposing pile of 356 millions imports of precious metals during thirty-three years opens up a wide field of "what is not seen" by the superficial observer or wholesale statistician, and which this Royal Commission seem to have very imperfectly surveyed.

II.

Now there is, lying nearer the surface, another view of this important passage in the Commission's proceedings which is not brought out as it stands. Mainly for brevity's sake, this may be treated interrogatorily. Will not persons unacquainted with the subject who may con that passage be led to suppose that the aggregate import of bullion was a balance that India received over and above its exports? Sir James Peile would, of course, know so well that this is not so that he might not think it needful to be explicit; but it would really seem from that remark of Lord Welby's, quoted above, as to a "great quantity of precious metals coming into the country and not going out" that the noble chairman, skilled financier though he be, was, for the moment at least, under the ineradicable British propensity of misapprehension regarding the chief dominant factor in India's commercial and industrial finance. What otherwise could his lordship mean—when the Indian witness "could not quite see" that the precious metals forming part of India's inadequate imports is equivalent to "wealth"—by the somewhat impatient remark: "Perhaps you hesitate to accept proofs of prosperity?" To this the witness answered: "I am quite open to correction; but I do not see clearly that the mere fact of importing gold and silver can mean [taken by itself] that the country is increasing in prosperity; that is a fallacy of the mercantile system long regarded as exploded." No one is better able than Lord Welby to appreciate the force of that remark. And the witness had already discounted Sir James Peile's prosperity argument founded on the import of bullion, by such obvious considerations as "those precious metals do not come in for nothing—a large part of the produce of the country goes out" in exchange for them; and "our exports are greater than our imports owing to the Home Charges" [payments for which there is no annual return]. "The fact that such large quantities of precious metals come into the country shows that the imports in other shapes are fewer than they would otherwise be." The italics are mine; and, as Lord Welby will perceive, these imports that do not come in pertain to "what is not seen" in the argument; and the more so, as the witness at once neatly turned his lordship's fallacious analogy as between his own bank pass-book and the whole mercantile transactions of India by the remark, "it all depends on what the total amount (on both sides) comes to." This leads me to suggest the question, has Lord Welby asked Sir James Peile to show him the total trade returns of India for those thirty-three years from which Sir James only gave the one incidental item? When that reference is duly made even that skilled financier may be astonished in realising that during that period India's export values exceeded her imports, treasure included, by many tens of millions. But, as the Commissioners have

before them Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's full tables exhibiting the figures of the constant unbalanced excess of India's exports over her imports, they can have no excuse, not is it to be expected that they will ignore that large factor as an index of India's adverse condition in her monetary, commercial, and industrial position amongst the civilised nations of the world.

III.

There is another and somewhat more difficult branch of "what is seen, and what is not seen" in connexion with this subject of India's monetary and commercial condition under the present political and administrative circumstances that can only be briefly touched upon here. This vital portion of the Indian question may be put thus:—As trade is free, the producer gets the market price; how then is he affected by the drain of produce in shape of exports for which there is no trade or special return (services, pensions, etc.) or only non-productive return? (as public debt, the bulk of it incurred in old wars)?

This was put by Sir J. B. Peile to Professor Gokhale in the usual conversational form as "what is seen," thus: "The produce that is sold, that passes out as surplus produce and is sold—it is quite a *voluntary matter to sell*—you must suppose that it would be (is) sold at a profit." Then the proposition was stated more precisely by the same Commissioner when pressing Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as to what difference there is between the receipts of the producer in Native States and of the producer of similar exports in British territory. Sir James Peile asked, and it was admitted that for the same ten sovereigns' worth of cotton each of the two gets the same amount: that is "what is seen." Now let me give so much of Mr. Dadabhai's answer as goes towards explaining "what is not seen" in this transaction, thus:—"The British Indian subject sends his ten sovereigns' worth of produce: that produce is here intercepted by the India Office in sending him a bill . . . out there (in India) to be paid *not* from the price that is got here from that produce, but from the *revenues* of India that are drawn upon to meet the bill which is presented there." Then in response to the query: "Does that in any way affect the profit of the native producer and exporter in India?" the Indian witness said "its effect is this, that as much is intercepted here (in England) by the India Office in sending its bills off that price of the produce, does not itself return to India, but in its place that price (value) of the produce is paid out of British (Indian) revenue, which in the case of the Native States is quite different, he gets back actually the return." As to this latter remark we shall find there is an important qualification applying to all exports from India when we consider the question of price, that is profit. And this brings us to the bed rock of the subject in respect of which, "what is not seen" is the dominant all-pervading factor.

IV.

Now, let Lord Welby and his colleagues turn to J. S. Mill's chapter xxi, "Distribution of the Precious Metals," and the concluding paragraph thereof, in which he describes the cause and effect of "International Payments not originating in Commerce." That remarkable passage cannot well be set out here; but to such instructed minds it should suffice if they would apply, to much that has been stated above, these two or three sentences:

"A country which makes regular [non-commercial] payments to foreign countries, besides losing what it pays, loses something more by the less advantageous *terms* on which it is

¹ Ordnance and other military stores, also all railway material are included in imports, *pro tanto* reducing the figures of excess exports.

forced to exchange its productions for foreign commodities. . . this lowers prices [and profits] in the remitting country and raises them in the receiving country. . . . The tribute or remittance will be virtually paid in goods. . . . The paying country [India] will give a higher price for all that it buys from the receiving country [or elsewhere] while the latter [England] besides receiving the tribute, obtains the exportable produce of the tributary country at lower prices."

Now this is precisely the case between India and the United Kingdom, as our italics and interpolated words serve to make it plain even to the wayfaring man. One more remark: In the course of Professor Gokhale's examination, Sir William Wedderburn interposed the explanatory query: "Is it not the case that the rayat is so much in the hands of the money lender, that is to say, the trader, that he has to give him his produce at the price the trader chooses to give him for it?" Just so; this is "what is seen" over the larger part of India; "what is not seen" in this matter are the present inexorable tributary conditions set out with such marvellous synthetic skill in J. S. Mill's short paragraph. The same case is stated in more popular form in course of Walter Bagehot's essays on "The Silver Question" written nearly twenty years ago.

AN EXAMINER IN POLITICAL ECONOMY.

MR. NATU'S LETTERS.

We print below the correspondence that passed between one of the brothers Natu, of Poona, and the Collector of Poona some time previously to the deportation of the former:—

From MR. BALWANT RAMACHANDRA NATU, Sirdar and Municipal Commissioner, City of Poona.
To the DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, Poona.

SIR,—His Excellency Lord Sandhurst came here twice from Bombay to advise all the citizens of Poona to co-operate with Government in carrying out all the preventive measures which Government would take to stamp out the plague in the City of Poona. We accordingly, considering it our duty to offer all possible help to the Plague Committee, did for some days the work of inspection along with the soldiers on duty, in spite of the humiliation we were subjected to. We did it with an intention of assisting as much as possible the Government officers and the citizens of Poona. Our work has been, and is, useful to the general public, but as the Plague Committee thinks otherwise, I am constrained to bring to your notice the following state of things:

1. We first informed Mr. Rand, the President of the Plague Committee, that public notices should be posted a day previous in the wards in which the inspection would take place, specifying the time of the inspection. We added that this step would enable the people to remain present in their shops and houses at the time of inspection, and in reply we were informed that the inhabitants of the quarters would be enabled to remove the plague patients of the locality to some other parts of the town in case a previous public intimation were given according to our suggestion. We urged the fact that anyone who was thus desirous of deceiving authorities by secreting the plague patients would be enabled to do so, in spite of the absence of a previous intimation, as soon as the inspecting party would visit those quarters. Even taking it for granted that an individual acted in this way, it would be much better for the safety of the citizens' property if a public notice were given. For it will obviate the necessity of breaking locks in owners' absence. A plague patient removed from one place to another could be detected next time, and the evil is not so great as the loss of property caused by breaking the locks of the shops and leaving them open after inspection. But no attention was paid to our suggestions.

2. The inspection being conducted in the morning time, it is inconvenient to people whose shops are generally locked up in the morning time. Again, many people have left the town through fear of the plague and have left behind their houses and shops locked up for safety. The locks were broken and

an entrance was forced not only at these places, but also at the offices of the suburban municipality, the collection office of the city municipality, and the Government registration office. These events are openly taking place, and the house to house inspection seems to have become a season of profitable trade to the lock manufacturers of the place.

3. If inspection be conducted as specified above, by breaking open the locks, the responsibility of protecting the property lies on Government. No effort seems, however, to have been made in that direction. On the first day of inspection, March 13, the soldiers broke into the houses and went away without leaving anybody to protect the property therein. On the very same day I wrote to Mr. Rand stating whatever omissions I found in the work of the inspection party which I accompanied in the Shukrawar Peth; but I have as yet received no reply either verbal or written. Hundreds of instances can be adduced of an inspection party breaking into the houses and going away without caring to leave them guarded. We asked the inspecting soldiers to make some provision for the protection of houses, but our requests were not attended to. We wrote to the authorities, i.e., the Plague Committee, to issue orders, but they too have made no arrangements.

4. There are many houses in Poona with two or more doors of entrance. The houses can still be recognised as one, as they have the same municipal number. Yet it is often found that if an inspection party enters such a house for inspection by one door, another party breaks forcibly into it by a door on some other side without heeding our remonstrances to the contrary. There are many such cases, but I would give two as typical: (1) The house of Rao Bahadur Narayan Bhai Dandiker in Shukrawar; and (2) The house of Babu Sahib Karwe in Sheinwar Peth.

5. We informed the Plague Committee of the unnecessary breaking open of the boxes. Before starting for the inspection work on the next day, the officers gave orders to the soldiers for not breaking open small boxes, and yet they have broken the boxes, some of which are extremely small, and have broken the wooden cover over iron safes in some other places.

6. This and the other manner of breaking the doors open is stated here on the information supplied by Rao Bahadur Narayan Bhai Dandiker, late Director of Public Instruction in the Hyderabad Assigned Districts. A lady residing near the Tambat's reservoir in the Kasabu Peth, was struck on the hips by a soldier. I took with me the two gentlemen who personally witnessed it and reported the case to Colonel Phillips. I do not know what steps have been taken in the matter the complainants thus bring to the notice of the plague authorities. The soldiers do not reveal the name of the offender, and identification is not possible for want of numbers.

7. A certain person named Eknath, simpi (tailor), is a tenant of the house of Seohar Vithal Natu in the Sheinwar Peth. He died of plague on March 7. On the next day the Municipal Committee disinfected the house and burnt his bedding and clothing. The remaining things were locked in the house by the members of his family and they left for another place. Some sixteen or seventeen days after, on March 24, one soldier and three sappers broke open the locks of the house, the clerk of the above-mentioned Natu tried to prevent them, when he was pushed aside, and both the locks of the simpi and Natu were broken, and the furniture in the house, including the sewing machine, the doors of the shop, the clothes of the customers, and all other furniture, except an earthen doll, was burnt, in spite of the protests of the house owner. It was worth some hundred to a hundred and twenty-five rupees. I went there about 9 a.m., while the burning was in full progress and advised the soldiers to desist; but was not heeded. And, asking for their names, they refused to give them. I asked for the name of the officer of the party, but there was no reply. Myself and Rao Sahib Bhalchandra Triambak Bapat then went to Mr. Rand to request him to accompany us to the spot and to see everything personally. He did not see us as he was busy for a long time. We prepared a written note and took it to Mr. Rand. He heard us and told us that it was not proper on our part to obstruct them instead of offering our help. We informed him that the soldiers of the inspecting party were always refractory and refused to give their names, and set at naught the orders of the higher authorities. The work was carried on in a way directly contrary to the spirit of the official orders, and it was strange that our conduct in reporting these

transactions was held to be obstructive. We reported the same in writing, but do not know what came out of it. The smouldering fire of the burnt articles lasted till the next day. Iron furniture like the sewing machine could not be burnt completely, but was rendered useless. I have personally showed all this to Colonel Phillips on the spot.

8. At the same time, I brought to the notice of Colonel Phillips the hardships to which certain inhabitants in the "Paga" of Rao Bahadur Khandero Viswanath Raste of the Mahun-purse were being put to owing to the segregation operation. A barber in one of the rooms in the chail fell ill. For this reason the inmates of some thirty-four or thirty-five rooms of this chail were taken to the segregation camp, and the rooms locked. The horses, cows, sheep, and other animals of the inmates, were left unprotected. There was nobody left to protect the property of so many families. In this plight the inmates were taken away without any covering to protect the body, or any other furniture for their use. They were placed under a military escort, and taken to the sower's gate. A day or two previous I had made enquiries about the way in which the segregation was to be carried on, and was told by the members of the Plague Committee that they would not segregate the inmates of all big houses for a plague case in a room, but only the inmates of the room actually infected, and, at best, the adjoining rooms on either side. I informed Colonel Phillips that the segregation operations were being carried on in a spirit directly opposed to the assurances we had received, but was told, in reply, that the procedure adopted was through the direction of the medical authorities. I would request you to personally see the place, in order to have an idea of the way in which the people have suffered through the segregation operations; or read the last issue of the *Suikharak*, of which I beg herewith to send a copy for your perusal. I would beg to draw your attention to the statements contained in that paper, which, in the words of the journal, rather understated the case than otherwise. Moreover, the apprehensions of the people that the segregation camp was not a safe place have been realised by the fact that plague cases have occurred even in the camp.

9. On March 25 a Muhammadan gentleman accompanied an inspection party, which I accompanied. He must have most probably come as a volunteer. He entered house No. 135 in the Shukrawar Peth, and arrested a Ramadassi beggar named Shanker, who lived in the house, on the pretence of examining him. He made a show of examining him, and told something to a soldier near. The said soldier and another, whom I at that time thought to be a soldier, pronounced it to be a doubtful case, and forcibly thrust the Ramadassi in a commissariat cart accompanying the party. He told the soldier to send the man either to Dr. Jones or Dr. Beveridge, as this was a doubtful case, and to send the man to the general plague hospital in case either of those medical gentlemen pronounced it to be a real plague case. I also told them that, under the existing regulations, they could not forcibly remove the man until he was regularly certified to be a plague patient. I was, however, not listened to, and Shanker was taken to the Sangama Hospital. I thought Shanker was not ill, and, therefore, asked the soldier to give me his name. He hesitated to give it for a long time, and, after some twenty or thirty minutes, he wrote down his name as—, on a piece of paper, and handed over the paper to me. At the very moment Colonel Phillips came there, and rebuked me for obstructing the work of the inspection party. I told him everything that had happened, and then he found out that I was not obstructing. I accompanied Colonel Phillips to Shaniwar Peth to point to him the burning of the simple furniture, as stated in ss. 7 and 8. Shanker's house was disinfected after he had been sent to the hospital, and his wife was taken to the segregation camp. After a while, Shanker was released from the hospital as not being affected by plague. He returned home to find it disinfected, his furniture destroyed, and his poor wife forcibly removed to the segregation camp. The house was disinfected, and all this trouble given to a man who was immediately proved to be not affected. This will prove how much misery was inflicted on him. His poor wife is, even till now, detained in the segregation camp. I do not know how to characterise this conduct.

10. I would also state here the treatment received by volunteers. On one day some of us were called to Budhavar and some to Bhamburda. Budhavar and Shanawar Peths are

quite close one to another, and as my house is in Shanawar, I thought my presence quite necessary there in case the search party went from Budhavar to Shanawar Peth. I went to Budhavar Peth and informed Mr. Rand, who was present there, that I could not go to Bhamburda if the Shanawar Peth where I resided was to be searched. He refused any information on the point. I was, therefore, compelled to express my inability to go to Bhamburda. You will, I dare say, hold me justified in so acting, but Mr. Rand thought otherwise. Last Saturday I was called to the Ganesh Peth Bridge. On reaching the place, Mr. Rand told me to accompany the party that was going to the Daru Wallah Bridge circle. I pointed out that as the Daru Wallah Bridge block was mostly inhabited by Muhammadans who keep their females in Gothas, it was advisable to entrust work to any of the Muhammadan volunteers who were present on the spot. He did not like the suggestion and told me that it was highly improper on my part to offer objections to every work that I was being entrusted with, and that my presence being no longer useful was dispensed with. I was, therefore, compelled to return. One can easily see how inconsistent is the treatment received by volunteers at the hands of the Plague Committee and the request made by His Excellency the Governor to the subordinate officer to the gentry of the city to volunteer their services. This and similar other acts of ill-treatment have diminished the number of volunteers. The soldiers pay no heed to their suggestions at the inspection time, and complaints made to the superior authorities are disposed of in the manner above specified. You will thus find that nothing but direct insult was the reward for the volunteer's services in Poona. In Bombay, the respectable gentry go to the places where they possess influence, and perform their duties with due respect to the customs, religion, and prejudices of the general populace, and specially the seclusion of the Maratha and Muhammadan females. His Excellency the Governor assured us that the same method would be brought into operation in this city; but as the real state is contrary to his intentions in all respects as above specified. I do not know what to say about it.

11. On March 20, a soldier pushed and insulted My. Nana Sahib Deo, a resident of Kanado's Wada in Kasaba Peth. As he has already reported to His Excellency the Governor, the same incident, in a letter of the same date, I do not wish to further allude to it here.

12. As District Magistrate you have got every authority to enquire into all grievances, and all this information, supplemented and supported by direct instances, has been sent to you with a hope that the difficulties and hardships which the by general public has been labouring under, would be removed means of the same. This will also acquaint you with the cause of the absence of many volunteers from the searching parties. Residence in Poona has become unsafe, and it is still more so to prefer complaints against any member or members of the Plague Committee, to whose safe keeping have been confided by Government the lives and property of the inhabitants of Poona. It is my prime duty, however, to inform you of the difficulties experienced by me in working as a volunteer. It is also highly necessary for you and the Government, in case you become acquainted only with one side of the case from the Plague Committee, to be informed of the other side of the same. As it is necessary to give you all this information, I am taking the step of sending this note to you. The present operations are, moreover, carried out in direct contravention of the firm determination of the British Government to allow no interference with the time-honoured customs, religion, or the female seclusion and other principles of Indian social polity. The result is a great amount of unrest among the general populace. It is my duty to acquaint you with the same, and beg you to be kind enough to inform me of the decision which you would arrive at in this matter. All the above-mentioned grievances are well-known, and have occurred in my presence, and I have informed you of those only which I have personally seen. Many more complaints have come to my notice. Though they might be true, I have not personally seen them, and do not, therefore, consider it proper to acquaint you with the same.

I beg to remain,

(Sd.) BALWANT RAMACHANDRA NATU.

Poona, March 30, 1897.

To the PRESIDENT, Poona Municipality.

With compliments. I beg to solicit your kindness to send

this note to the District Magistrate of Poona, after kindly perusing the same.

(Sd.) BALWANT RAMACHANDRA NATU.

Dated, March 30, 1897.

No. 4744 of 1897.

Poona District Magistrate's Office,
Junar 10, April 11, 1897.

Vernacular Yadi from Sirdar and Municipal Commissioner,
B. R. NATU, dated, March 30, 1897.

Subject.—“Anti-Plague Measures in Poona City.”

Reply of the DISTRICT MAGISTRATE OF POONA.

It is quite right that those who see the actual working of the anti-plague measures should make reasonable suggestions for their improvement.

2 With regard to the suggestions now made, it is impossible to give previous notice of when each day's inspection is to take place, or that places found closed should not be opened for inspection. All persons know that the inspection is in progress, and it behoves each man to take adequate care of his own property.

3. It is, of course, useless to break open small boxes to search for plague cases, and the native gentlemen and others who accompany the search parties no doubt prevent such unnecessary proceedings, as also all improper treatment of persons found in the house, whether male or female.

4. Generally, there does not appear to be anything in the manner in which operations are being conducted which necessitates the District Magistrate's interference. A very difficult and dangerous duty is, it seems to him, being performed with a most commendable thoroughness, and he is glad that Mr. Natu's yadi, by not pointing out any serious defects, bears testimony to the general excellence of the arrangements.

(Sd.) R. A. LAMB, District Magistrate, Poona.

Received 14/4/97. B. R. NATU.

From Mr. BALWANT RAMACHANDRA NATU, Sirdar and Municipal Commissioner, Poona City.

To the COLLECTOR and DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, POONA.

SIR,—I beg, first of all, to thank you for your reply, No. 4,744, dated April 11, 1897, of whatever kind it may be, to my yadi, dated March 13, 1897, and venture to trouble you further with such information as I have subsequently obtained together with what I have to say regarding the twelve points referred to in my last letter, and which have not been all touched in your reply, hoping it may be of some use to lay that information before you.

There are hundreds of persons in Poona who carry on their business from 6 to 11 a.m. in the fruit and the vegetable market and other places, and being single, who go out for business after locking up their houses. If these men do not know when their houses will be inspected they will have to wait idly in their houses for a month or two at the risk of losing the source of their livelihood. You will see how essential it is to notify the time of inspection to these people. There are days of famine, and if such people give up work for months, they stand in danger of being starved. Several merchants have again left Poona on account of plague, entrusting their shops and houses to single guards. If the latter go to the shops the houses are forced open in their absence, while if they guard the houses the locks of the shops are broken. In this way property is not well protected.

You observe that the native gentlemen accompanying the search parties should prevent all improper treatment of persons found in the house; but I beg to observe that the soldiers not only pay no attention to our suggestions, but refuse to give their names or that of the commanding officer, and the case, even though reported to the Plague Committee, goes unattended. I do not know how we are to act under these circumstances, and shall be glad to conform to any directions that you may be pleased to give.

We are not heard if we urge that temples, godhouses, and kitchens should be searched, not by British soldiers, but better classes—native sepoys—in suspicious cases. Nor is our request to remove old and weak people to hospital only after proper medical examination heeded. They are taken to the hospital in haste; and the disinfecting party not only disinfects the house and burns the property, but removes the other inmates of the house to the segregation camp. The man taken on suspicion to the hospital is soon discharged, and finds himself and his house in the state above described. We have informed

the authorities of these complaints, but nothing is being done in the matter.

I have reported to Mr. Rand the conduct of the soldiers in entering the temple of Rameshwar, Gundas Ganpati, and that of the Gujarati Maharaja, but I do not know what steps have been taken in the matter. But, whether because I made the complaint or otherwise, some soldiers came to inspect a private temple belonging to me. On being told that it was a temple, and that if they had any suspicion it should be inspected, not by the soldiers, but by gentlemen accompanying the party, the objection was communicated to Major Maud (P). Thereupon some ten or twelve soldiers and Dr. Kiddle (though it was not necessary to call a doctor) entered the temple, and searched it all. If your Honour still thinks that this is consistent with the expressed wishes of his Excellency, and that there is nothing in the manner in which the plague operations are being conducted to call for your interference, we must regard it as a misfortune, so far as our people and religion are concerned.

Again, on April 13, a searching party inspected the house of Mr. Hasabnis, an inamdar, in the Shanwar Peth. There was an old man in the house, and Mr. Hasabnis attempted to explain that he was weak through age, and not on account of plague. Whereupon Major Maud ordered Mr. Hasabnis to go with him for four hours. I protested against this illegal confinement, to which Major Maud replied that, though Mr. Hasabnis was not a plague patient, he was being carried to gaol for obstructing the work of the search party. Mr. Hasabnis was detained till 11 a.m. in the custody of sowars. I urged that if he obstructed the work of the search party his name and address might be taken down, and he should be prosecuted according to law; but it seems that the commanding officer took the law into his own hands, and punished Mr. Hasabnis by asking him to go with the party for four hours. It is our misfortune if you do not consider this conduct unjust; if otherwise, you will kindly arrange to prevent its recurrence in future.

I hope that, for reasons given above, you will kindly take steps to remove the hardships and sufferings of the Poona people. At any rate, I hope I shall not myself be put to further inconvenience for bringing these complaints to your notice.

I beg, etc.,

(Sd.) BALWANT RAMACHANDRA NATU.

Poona, April 15, 1897.

No. 5314 of 1897.

Poona Collector's Office,
Camp Manchar, April 24, 1897.

Vernacular Yadi from Sirdar and Municipal Commissioner,
B. R. NATU, dated, April 15, 1897.

Subject.—“Anti-Plague Measures in Poona City.”

Reply of the COLLECTOR OF POONA.

MOST or all of the matters referred to in your yadi have already been brought to the notice of the Plague Committee, Poona, and such action, if any, as appears feasible is taken on all complaints that are made to the Committee.

(Sd.) R. A. LAMB, Collector and District
Magistrate of Poona.

THE LIBERAL LEADERS AND THE “FORWARD” POLICY.

MR. JOHN MORLEY AT ARBROATH.

“IT IS ALL NONSENSE.”

Mr. John Morley, M.P., addressing his constituents at Arbroath, N.B., on September 28, said in the course of his speech:

Well, now I am going to take you to India, where, as you know, there is a conflagration of more or less magnitude upon the North-Western frontier. I am sure you all read what goes on in these military operations. Gentlemen, this is not at all the time for opening up the large and even momentous issues which are involved in our frontier policy. Brave men

and ablest men are now striving, at the peril of their lives, to bring to an end the mischief which unwise men set loose. We watch the efforts of these brave men of ours, and of their native comrades, with interest and with confidence, and we all wish them a rapid success in their unwelcome and, I venture to think, barren task. But while this is not a moment to discuss the policy, it is a moment when untoward events quicken political comprehensions, and quicken national consciences: it is a moment, while we watch this endeavour to cut down the fire, to look at the policy which kindled the flame.

THE RESULT OF THE "FORWARD" POLICY.

I am not going into it at any length, because there is one other subject which will take me all the time that your patience will permit. But I will say this, and this is clear, that this fierce rising of the wild tribes on the North-Western frontier of India is the result of the prevalence for some years past of a forward policy, and especially—and I call your attention to this—of the unfortunate determination of the present Government to follow a policy of activity in extension in the direction of the Valley of Chitral. You will recollect that in the spring of 1895 a military expedition was despatched to rescue certain British officers in danger at Chitral. The rescue was effected with remarkable promptitude and energy, and then the question was left whether we should retain a foothold in Chitral or keep away. That came before the Liberal Cabinet of 1895. The Government of India held the view that we ought to hold on; men, on the other hand, of the highest military authority and experience were averse. They said, "You had much better come away," and so far as we, the Government of 1895, were able to ascertain, the preponderance of expert and valuable military opinion was in favour of our coming away. I won't detain you with talking as to general grounds, financial grounds, and otherwise, which were present before us, but I cannot pass over one of the most important of all the considerations that were present in our minds when we determined on the evacuation of Chitral. When the expedition was setting out for the relief of Dr. Robertson, the Viceroy issued a proclamation—and I would invite your serious attention to this because your judgment on transactions of this kind goes to the roots of national honour and national character. The Viceroy issued a proclamation in which he promised certain tribes that the Government had no intention of permanently occupying any territories through which a certain chief's misconduct might now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes, and that as soon as the particular object with which they entered Chitral territory had been obtained the force would be withdrawn. It was because of that promise of the Viceroy that some of these wild tribesmen allowed the forces of the Indian Government to go through their territory. We held that to take any step which might be construed as meaning a permanent occupation of the Chitral valley, or of the territory of the tribesmen, would be to break faith—and to break faith, mark you, as I have already said, with those who, on the strength of this promise, had not opposed the advance of our relief expedition. Well, we decided in 1895 to direct the evacuation of the Chitral territory. Events have proved that we were terribly right. (Cheers.) On the very day on which my able and eloquent friend, who was then Secretary for India, Sir Henry Fowler, was sitting down to write his despatch conveying this decision, I think that was the very day when an adverse vote in the House of Commons unfortunately slit the thread of our existence. What happened afterwards was that our successors, in the plenitude of their wisdom and their foresight, flung themselves into the arms of the forward party, of the military party, with the lamentable results you see. I do not deny that other causes contributed to this outbreak, but no reasonable man can or does doubt that the nonfulfilment of our promise had a powerful effect in stirring up the frontier tribes against us. There was a regular course only too familiar to us in all these forward operations.

THE "FORWARD" RAKE'S PROGRESS.

These are the five stages of the "forward" Rake's progress. (Laughter.) First, to push on into places where you have no business to be, and where you had promised you would not go—(hear, hear)—second, your intrusion is resented, and in these wilds resentment means resistance; third, you instantly cry out that the people are rebels and their act is rebellion, in spite of your own assurances that you had no intention of setting up a permanent sovereignty over them; fourth, you send forces to stamp out the rebellion; fifth, having spread

bloodshed and confusion and anarchy, you declare with hands uplifted to heaven, that moral reasons force you to stay, for if you were to leave this territory would be left in a condition no civilised power could contemplate with equanimity and composure. These are the five stages of the "forward" Rake's Progress.

THE GOVERNMENT'S WANT OF FORESIGHT.

To show how blind these men are, let me recall what the Secretary of State for India, when declining this action in 1895, said of this operation, after this reversal of our policy: "We have now arrived"—this is two years ago—"at a settlement of our frontier difficulties. We have, I think, by these arrangements, utilised the results of the Chitral expedition, and my one wish now is"—this is the Secretary of State speaking in 1895—"to look to the condition of Indian finance, to associate with the satisfactory settlement of these frontier questions a period of quietude and economy." (Laughter.) That was the degree of foresight of her Majesty's Government. Was there ever so unlucky a prophet? "A satisfactory settlement of these frontier questions." You see how they are settled. "Quietude and economy!" Why, I am told by those who are very competent to judge these proceedings that they will cost five millions sterling if they cost a rupee. "Quietude and economy!" This is all I have to say on this point. There will be much to be said about it before we have done with it. It is obviously bad to turn these tribes into enemies, and to incline them to be the friends of the invader, if ever an invader should be minded to approach India through those high uplands and valleys. It is bad, but what is worst of all is that it means laying upon India, which is a poor country, and which is at this moment in vast areas undergoing all the horrors and distress of famine—it means imposing upon India a burden which India cannot reasonably, perhaps, not possibly, be expected to bear. From my point of view the military side is the least part of this unfortunate proceeding—it is the effect upon Indian finance. Many men of the highest authority will tell you that the finance of India, even, as it is, is a ruinous finance. I won't argue, but I saw a statement the other day that the cost of the "forward" policy in India during the last twenty years has been something like £50,000,000 sterling. And now you will add several millions more. Gentlemen, you really think it is a far cry from Arbroath to Calcutta, but you are responsible; you in Arbroath here, though far from Calcutta and Simla, are responsible. You can protect yourselves; you have your representative in the House of Commons, and can protect yourselves partially through your representative; but the Indian taxpayer is helpless, and I am sure you will agree with me that it is a monstrous thing, upon a point where military experts differ diametrically, to put upon this wretched and famine and plague-stricken country an increased burden, because some military men say that if you take this valley of that valley your frontier will be a little safer. ("Nonsense," and laughter.) I for one agree with my friend here who says it is all nonsense. Is it common sense? If there were to be a Russian or any other invasion of India, is it not far better that Russia should have, or any invader should have, to make her way against hostile tribes through this intractable country and then find itself face to face with a British force that has been marching fully prepared? It does not require a general to see the folly of this policy. (Hear, hear.)

MR. ASQUITH AT LADYBANK.

"ONE GOOD RESULT—RECONSIDERATION."

Mr. H. H. Asquith, M.P., addressing his constituents at Ladybank, N.B., on September 30, said, in the course of his speech:—

I desire in the few moments which I will still encroach upon your attention to-night to confine myself to one topic and one only, and that is the war which is at present being waged upon the frontier of our Indian Empire. Let me say at the outset, whatever may be our opinion as to the origin of this lamentable occurrence and as to the responsibility for its having arisen, we are all of us, I am certain, full of sympathy and admiration for the efforts which are being made by our gallant soldiers, both of the British and of the native forces—(cheers)—who, amid difficulties which rarely present themselves to

modern warfare, are worthily maintaining the best traditions alike of the British and of the Indian army. But what was the cause? How comes it, and that in a year in which, as I stated a short time ago, India is suffering both from famine and plague, at a time, therefore, when it ought to be, and I doubt not is, the object of all who are responsible for her government to husband her resources and to pursue her policy of conciliation and peace—how comes it, I say, that at such a time India has had to summon to her frontier no fewer than 60,000 soldiers, and has engaged in an expedition the ultimate cost of which, according to the best authorities, cannot be measured in less than millions of pounds sterling? Gentlemen, there are many fantastic explanations afloat, particularly among the speakers and writers who support the present Government, of this lamentable state of things. Perhaps the most fantastic of them is that the Afridis and the Mohmands and the other Muhammadan tribes of the frontier have been moved to a demonstration of sympathy with the Sultan of Turkey by the outrageous attacks which have been made upon that virtuous monarch—(laughter)—in the columns of the English press. Unfortunately, we need not go so far afield to find a cause for what is going on in India.

THE RETENTION OF CHITRAL.

In my judgement, at any rate, the vastly preponderating weight both of probability and of evidence shows that, though our frontier policy for years past may have prepared for, and contributed to the rising which we are now witnessing, the provoking and the exciting cause is to be found in the measures which, as I think, were most improvidently and unwisely adopted by the present Government in relation to Chitral. Ladies and gentlemen, let me remind you, in two or three sentences, of the facts. This is a matter, although it is removed from us by many thousands of miles, which vitally affects both our interests and our honour. In the early part of the year 1895, when we were still responsible for the conduct of public affairs, we found ourselves under the necessity of sending an expedition to Chitral, a remote, mountainous spot, far removed from the extreme North-Eastern Frontier of India, in order to rescue a British officer who had been treacherously held captive by the native ruler of that place. When that expedition was despatched the Government of India, which was, of course, immediately although not ultimately, responsible for it, issued a proclamation to the native tribes through whose territory the British force was about to pass. The language of that proclamation, gentlemen, and its meaning have been so much distorted both by speakers and by organs of opinion in the press that I think it right to quote its exact terms to-night. It reads—I am quoting only one, but it is a material passage—"The Government of India," they say, "have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes." It goes on:—"And they will scrupulously avoid any acts of hostility towards the tribesmen so long as they, on their part, refrain from attacking or impeding in any way the march of the troops." Ladies and gentlemen, that is written in pretty plain language, and what does it mean? It means, as we understood it at the time and as I understand it now, that the Government of India gave two solemn undertakings. The first was that they would not permanently occupy any territory through which the expedition would now have to pass, or interfere with the independence of the tribes. The second was that they would avoid even any acts of hostility towards the tribesmen on the way unless those acts were provoked by attacks on the part of the tribesmen themselves. We are told now that those assurances—clearly conveyed, as I have shown you, in intelligible language, and universally understood at the time, both by us here in England and by the tribesmen to whom they were addressed, in the sense I have put upon them—were not a promise, but only the expression of our intention. Gentlemen, that is a kind of casuistry which may be in vogue in London and Edinburgh, but it is not very well understood among the wild tribes of the North-Eastern frontier. (Laughter.) We were told, further, in defiance of the plain intimation which I have read out to you to-night, that the first and the totally independent promise to respect the integrity of the territory through which the expedition was to pass was contingent on the tribesmen not attacking the expedition on the way. That condition, as I have shown you, and as the language plainly proves, related not to the first, but to the second, of the two promises given

by the Indian Government. (Cheers.) Well, it was after that proclamation had been issued in these plain, unambiguous terms that the expedition went on its way and, after it accomplished its purpose, that we who were then responsible for the conduct of affairs had on its return to consider what was to be done with Chitral.

"THIS GROSS BREACH OF FAITH."

Gentlemen, we had no doubt whatsoever, although we gave long and patient and careful consideration, extending, if I remember aright, over two or three months, to all the arguments on the one side and on the other—we had no doubt as to what conclusion we should arrive—that we should withdraw not only from Chitral itself, but from the intervening territory to which this proclamation refers. (Cheers.) We thought so for a multitude of reasons, of which I will only give you three in three sentences, because I think they are quite adequate for the purpose. In the first place, we thought we were bound to fulfil what we conceived to be a solemn undertaking of the Indian Government. In the second place, we were advised by officers of the greatest local knowledge and experience that the occupation of Chitral, which meant of necessity the making of a road between Peshawar, the extreme point in India, and Chitral—a distance, I suppose, of 120 or 160 miles—the making of a road, the building of forts upon that road, and the occupation of those forts either by our own soldiers or by subsidized native tribesmen—we were advised that measures of that kind would inevitably arouse in the minds of the tribes of the district suspicions as to our ulterior purposes, and that we should find the keeping of Chitral and of the intervening country a matter which sooner or later would tax the resources of India herself. In the third place, we resolved to go because Chitral, and the way between Chitral, is of no value whatsoever to any human being, and least of all to the British Empire. We had concluded at that time, I am glad to say, an agreement with Russia by means of which the whole of the boundary between the Russian and British spheres of influence throughout Central Asia, from west to east, had been clearly mapped out and laid down. And the sole purpose for which Chitral, or any one of these outlying and inaccessible places, has been occupied and retained, is to counteract some imaginary and contingent enterprise upon the part of Russia for the invasion of our Indian Empire. We thought these reasons adequate. The present Government, however, had not been in office a month before they reversed our decision, before they resolved to retain possession of Chitral, with the necessary consequence of occupying, by means of forts and of garrisons, the intervening space. Can you wonder that when it was gradually brought home to the minds of the tribes concerned that there had been what they considered, and what I certainly for myself consider, this gross breach of faith upon the part of the Indian Government, and that further, as had been predicted to us, and as the event has proved with the most perfect accuracy, they drew from the establishment of these positions the inference that their independence was threatened, and that annexation to India was with them only a question of time? Can you wonder that feelings of resentment and of unsettlement were aroused which, after they had fermented for a time, have at last found their expression in the rising with which you are now confronted?

"A NEW AND ALTERNATIVE POLICY."

That rising has spread from one end of the frontier to another, because the annexation of Chitral was only the extreme application of principles which now, unhappily for 20 years past, have been pursued in relation to our frontier policy in India, which have scattered along the whole of that vast frontier roads, forts, strong places, occupied in some cases by British troops, in other cases by subsidized levies from the local troops which, as the greatest authorities tell us, are of no advantage whatever for the purpose of spreading civilisation, and which, as the present outbreak has shown, the moment war is declared become a source of danger. In my judgement the responsibility for this grave situation and strain, from which undoubtedly India will emerge, but emerge at an enormous and most unnecessary cost both of life and of treasure, ought to be laid at the doors of an ill-considered decision by which, in defiance of the assurance of the Indian Government, and of all considerations of sound and sagacious policy, this annexation of Chitral was maintained and continued. (Cheers.) I trust that, at any rate, these troubles will have one good result—that they may lead to the reconsideration, and that at

no distant time, of the lines upon which our Indian frontier policy has for the past 20 years been carried on, and that it will be possible for the future to arrive at a new and alternative policy which will in no way diminish the security of India, and will free her from the constant liabilities of those harassing expeditions which her resources, which were never rich, and which have recently been the subject of exceptional and trying calamity, cannot meet.

MR. MORLEY AT FORFAR.

BACK TO LORD LAWRENCE.

In the course of a speech delivered at Forfar on October 4, Mr. John Morley said:—

You may have seen that when I was speaking the other night in another burgh of this group I referred to a state of affairs on the North-Western frontier of India, and I ventured to point out that the doings of the present Government as contrasted with the doings of the late Government in the matter of what is known as Chitral, were certainly, in some part, responsible for the unpleasant conflagration which is now raging on the frontier. Well, I have been taken to book for all this by a newspaper in Scotland, which is always remarkable for the affability with which it conducts political controversy. (Laughter, and hear, hear.) They say—and I think it is worth while for me to nail a bad shilling to the counter when I see it—(a laugh, and hear, hear)—they say—and the subject is one of great importance—they say that, after all, Lord Kimberley, who was the Secretary of State for India in the Government of which I had the honour to be a member, said this—that it was a matter of importance that we should be able to control the external affairs of Chitral. Well, and then they ask, plausibly enough, How can you control the external affairs of Chitral if you have no post of observation there? Well, but then, up to five years ago, there was no Resident in Chitral and Lord Kimberley himself, whom they vouch as overthrowing the position which I ventured to take up at Arbroath—they forget that Lord Kimberley himself said, having alleged that we ought to maintain—that we ought to be able to control the external affairs of Chitral—that Lord Kimberley himself said it was not intended to maintain permanently a Resident Officer in Chitral. Well, I don't know. These are very technical matters, but I hope you follow them. It may be said, "Oh, but since Lord Kimberley said it was not intended to retain a Resident at Chitral, there has been the campaign." Gentlemen, that does not affect the argument at all. If it was not important, as the Secretary of State of our Government said it was not, to maintain permanently a Resident in Chitral before the agreement which was arrived at between Russia and ourselves in respect of the Pamirs, how on earth can it be more important now than it was then to have a Resident there—to retain a post of observation? Gentlemen, since the agreement between ourselves and Russia upon the Pamir frontier has been arrived at, whatever arguments there were before for our retention of an Agent at Chitral, have not been strengthened, but weakened by that very agreement come to between ourselves and Russia.

"ANOTHER BAD SHILLING."

Well, I must detain you for a minute more whilst I nail another bad shilling to the counter which has been attempted to be put into circulation from the same mint. Our very able friend, Sir Henry Fowler, the Secretary of State for India after Lord Kimberley, is also vouched as making it impossible for persons to make good the charge of breach of faith. And what did Sir Henry Fowler say in the House of Commons? He made two speeches in August or September, 1895, and what he said in these two speeches in the same debate came to this, that if the Government made a road through the territory of these tribes otherwise than by peaceable arrangement with the tribes, to whom a certain proclamation was issued, then there would have been a breach of faith with these tribes. Well, is it contended—and this is almost all I have got to say on the matter—is it contended that a peaceable arrangement was made? The rising, which some of you may have read of, in the Swat Valley, was at the beginning—at all events, it happened in the early part of these troubles on the Indian frontier—and was a protest, as Indian experts inform us

against the right of transit claimed by the Indian Government. Well, so much—I am not to detain you more than that—so much for the right of our political opponents to touch the last Liberal Secretary of State. (Cheers.)

THE POLICY OF LAWRENCE IS THE POLICY OF THE LIBERAL PARTY.

But I don't want quite to leave this subject. I must have another sentence on it to say I don't want to leave it because I believe there is nothing on which Liberals ought to set their hearts more firmly than resistance—strong resistance—to what is called the forward policy in India. (Cheers.) This is no new story. Those of you who are old enough to recollect well, as I do, all the talk something like twenty years ago about a scientific frontier, those arguments—the arguments of what were called a scientific frontier then were exactly the arguments which we hear to-day, and on which we shall hear more by-and-by; and the same resistance which was offered to those arguments—the same dispersion of the force of those arguments in 1878-9-80—I believe the same resistance ought to be offered, and will be offered, to any further tamperings with what is called a forward policy. When I am asked, as I am asked by these journals who oppose us in Scotland, why, instead of dwelling so much on the point of breach of faith why we don't declare our policy in broad terms I am quite willing to meet them, and answer them. I am not to expound our policy in any poor terms of mine. I will expound it in the words of one of the most able, experienced and powerful Indian Governors that India has ever had. I will tell you what Lord Lawrence said. I won't give it you in his own words, but mainly in his own words, and this is what it comes to: Should a foreign power, such as Russia, ever seriously think of invading India from without, or of stirring up the elements of disaffection or anarchy within it, our strongest security would lie in previous abstinences from entanglements at either Kabul, Kandahar, or any similar outpost. It would be in full reliance on a compact and disciplined army stationed within our own territories. It would lie—and you will well be able to understand this—in the contentment of the masses of the population of India. (Cheers.) It would lie in the construction of material works within British India, which enhance the comfort of the people, while they add to our political stability and strength. It would lie in husbanding our finances and consolidating and multiplying our resources. It would lie in the rectitude and honesty of our intentions coupled with the avoidance of all sources of complaint, which either invite foreign aggression or stir up restless spirits of revolt." (Cheers.) When you see it stated in these prints that we have no policy, my answer is, that we fall back upon that policy every step in deserting which has been accomplished by mischievous expenditure, by some political mischiefs, and every step forward from which will involve you in further expenditure, if not in more and deeper mischiefs than those mischiefs of expenditure. (Hear, hear.)

MR. ASQUITH AT KILMARNOCK.

"EXTRAORDINARY RESOURCES OF SOPHISTRY AND CASUISTRY."

In the course of a speech delivered at Kilmarnock, Ayrshire, on October 6, Mr. Asquith said:—

But let us turn for a moment to another part of the globe, in which we ourselves, as Englishmen and Scotsmen, have a still more direct interest and responsibility. I mean our great dependency of India. India has been visited during the present year by calamities which are due to natural and to economic causes, and which, probably, the foresight of no Government, however ably administered, could possibly have anticipated or prevented. But the state of things—happily as we see dangers both from famine and from plague have somewhat abated, if they have not altogether disappeared—the state of things which confront you at the present moment in India is the direct, and, I will venture to say, the necessary, outcome of the reversal by the present Government of the policy of their predecessors.

"IN RESPONSE TO ORDERS FROM HERE."

I am referring, of course, to this vast and extended rising upon the north-western frontier which, at a moment when

India is ill able, from the disasters to which I have already referred, to bear any exceptional strain, is compelling her to assemble a large army, and to incur week after week, and probably month after month, an expenditure which her resources are ill calculated to sustain. I endeavoured a few days ago, when I was addressing my own constituents in Fife, to go into the details of this matter, and to show that this rising has originated from the fact that the Indian Government—I do not make them responsible, because it is the Government here that is responsible—in response to orders from here, determined upon the permanent occupation of Chitral, and, for that purpose, upon the occupation, by means of a road and by means of forts, of the intervening territory occupied by independent tribes. Gentlemen, we had to consider this matter during the last months in which we were in office, and we considered it carefully and long, and we came unanimously to the conclusion—and, for my part, I cannot recall any question of administration or of policy with which I have ever had to deal in which the preponderance of argument seemed to be so strong—irresistible—upon one side as compared with the other. We came to the conclusion that both as a matter of honour in view of the pledges given by the Indian Government and as a matter of policy in view of our relations both to Russia and to India herself, it was imperatively necessary that this occupation should not take place, and that these outlying posts, of no value whatever to India, should be evacuated. (Cheers.) The Indian Government issued a proclamation when the original expedition to Chitral was undertaken, assuring the tribes through whose territory the force was about to pass that their land was in no danger of being permanently occupied by the Indian Government. I am—I was going to say amused, but rather I shall say I am amused to see the extraordinary resources of sophistry and of casuistry which have been brought to bear to explain away that promise and its non-performance. (Hear, hear.) They say it is not occupying the territory of a country if you only run a road through it, and claim a right-of-way and garrison that way by a force every few miles along the road. Well, gentlemen, I suppose we ought to be very precise, in our statesmanship and diplomacy, in the use of language; but I confess, to me, as a plain and humble student of the English language, that that does amount to occupation in every real and effective sense of the term; and I am perfectly certain if I could put myself in the position of one of the head men of these semi-cultured, semi-naked, semi-savage tribes I should certainly assume—I should draw the inference at once, that the promise made not to occupy my country had been flagrantly violated.

"BURDENSOME AND OUTLYING POSTS."

We are told that the Liberal Government, and Lord Kimberley, one of its ablest members, had said that Chitral was a place where it was necessary that India should have a post of observation. But our critics entirely suppress the date at which that declaration was made. It is true—not that he advocated the annexation of Chitral or of the intervening country, but that he did say in 1893 that it was desirable to maintain a Resident there. But what had happened in the interval? What had happened was a fact that it was very convenient for these gentlemen to ignore—a fact upon which I look back as one of the most fruitful achievements of the Government of Lord Rosebery, of which I was a member. (Cheers.) That fact is this, that, by bringing ourselves alongside, in a candid and cordial spirit, the statesmanship and the diplomacy of Russia, by frankly and freely abandoning the exploded superstition—to quote Lord Salisbury's own words—of an antiquated diplomacy that there was a certain natural antagonism between Russia and Great Britain in Asia, we arranged, by friendly convention, a strict and complete demarcation and arrangement of the boundaries of our spheres of influence in the region of the Pamirs, and consequently the necessity ceased to last for the maintaining of those posts of observation in those outlying districts of the frontier, whatever necessity there might have been in the past. It was in view of the fact of that concluded agreement, which gives either Russia or Britain a right to claim it as a *cumuli belli* if the frontier is crossed—it was that fact that convinced us that we ought to retire from these burdensome and outlying posts, which impose on the resources of India an excessive and unwarrantable strain. (Cheers.) The present Government had not been in office a month before they reversed this decision, and resolved on the occupation of Chitral and the construction

of these intervening works; and it is the gradual realisation in the native mind, and the consequent unsettlement of their feelings, and a growing apprehension that they would lose their independence, which is the direct and the certain origin of the disturbances which you have at present in India. (Cheers.) Well, that is another case in which I would like to ask those who were deluded by the brilliant promises and hopes of 1895—if I may use a vulgar expression—whether they have got change for their money. (Laughter.)

"A GROSS BREACH OF FAITH."

LORD NORTHBROOK'S PLEA—

The *Times* of October 14 contained the following letter from Lord Northbrook, under the heading "Lord Elgin and Chitral":—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

Sir,—It is well known that after the relief of Chitral in the spring of 1895 Lord Rosebery's Government decided to withdraw the garrison from that place, and that upon the change of Government in the following June their decision was reversed by the present Administration. I am one of those who think that Lord Rosebery was right, and I am not surprised that his colleagues should attribute the present troubles on the North-Western frontier of India, in whole or in part, to the reversal of their policy. But Mr. John Morley and Mr. Asquith, in their recent speeches at Lady Bunk and Arbroath, have gone much further than this. Mr. Asquith has charged the Government of India with "a gross breach of faith," and Mr. Morley has made the same accusation in milder language.

This accusation is a very grave one. I have therefore taken pains to examine the facts of the case so far as they are known to the public; and I have no hesitation in expressing my conviction that the charge of breach of faith against Lord Elgin is unfounded.

The reason advanced in support of it is that in a proclamation addressed in March, 1895, to the tribes whose territory the expedition for the relief of Chitral was about to traverse, they were assured that "the Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes;" and it is alleged that the arrangements afterwards made for opening out and protecting a road from Chitral to the frontier of British India involve a violation of the assurances given in that proclamation.

These assurances certainly did not preclude the conclusion of friendly arrangements with the tribes through whose territory the road passes for opening out and protecting it. Indeed, Sir Henry Fowler, who was Secretary of State for India in Lord Rosebery's Government, said in the House of Commons in September, 1895: "The Indian Government believe—I do not agree with them—that peaceful arrangements can be made for the construction of this road. If they are made, of course there will be no violation of the terms of the proclamation."

It remains, then, to be seen whether peaceful arrangements were actually made with the tribes, and whether those arrangements were entered into voluntarily by them. Anyone who will lay out the trifling sum of 3d. upon a paper presented to Parliament in 1896, entitled "Correspondence Relating to the Occupation of Chitral," may easily satisfy himself upon this subject. In that paper an account of the negotiations with the tribes is given in ample detail. The instructions to the officers charged with the duty leave nothing to be desired in respect to the determination of Lord Elgin scrupulously to adhere to the terms of the proclamation, and also to secure that any arrangement with the tribes should be freely entered into by them and "not forced upon them."

against their will." Although two of them urgently petitioned to be annexed to British India they were told that "Government in their proclamation informed all tribes that they had no desire to interfere with their independence, and there was no hope of a departure from that policy." The tribes freely undertook to protect the road. The levies intrusted with the duty were not placed under British officers, lest there should be any misconception of the intentions of the Government. An arrangement was entered into whereby the tribes agreed not to levy transit duties on the road in return for certain allowances; and it was at the desire of the tribes themselves, expressed in petitions which will be found in the paper, that a force of Imperial troops was temporarily stationed at the Malakand Pass.

I shall not enter upon the question whether the endeavour to open out this road was wise or not, or what the effect may have been upon other tribes not immediately concerned. I am simply and solely dealing with the accusation of breach of faith made against Lord Elgin, and I trust that in the face of the facts which I have briefly related we shall hear no more of this charge.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

October 12.

NORTHBROOK.

—AND MR. JOHN MORLEY'S REPLY.

The *Times* of October 19 printed this rejoinder from Mr. John Morley:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

SIR,—It is satisfactory to find that a person of Lord Northbrook's Indian authority thinks that the decision of the Liberal Cabinet in 1895 to withdraw from Chitral was right, and that the reversal of that policy by their successors in office was wrong. He does not, however, concur with Mr. Asquith and me in counting breach of faith among the elements of the mischief that has followed the reversal of the policy of the late Cabinet; and he denies that there has been any violation of the proclamation, because the arrangements for opening and maintaining the road from Chitral to the frontier of India were made peaceably and voluntarily with the tribes.

Even if it could be more strongly supported by the evidence in the Parliamentary papers than is actually the case, this contention does not meet the point at issue. The breach of faith, as we have argued from the first, took place when the new Government at home, following the advice of the Government of India, announced in July, 1895, that it was about to establish and maintain, if necessary by force, a permanent right of way through the territories of tribes whose independence and integrity we had promised to preserve. The late Cabinet said, among other objections, that this was to break faith, and refused to sanction it, and agreed that the Secretary of State should tell Lord Elgin so, and should inform him of the grounds of our refusal. It is surely idle to talk to-day of our bringing charges and accusations against the Indian Government simply because we uphold the validity of an objection to a certain decision, which objection we took while that decision was still open, and which we consider that events have strengthened and justified.

The head of the late Government told the House of Lords in 1895 (August 15)—I dare say Lord Northbrook was present—the four reasons which induced the Liberal Cabinet, after full consideration of the views of their military advisers, to direct withdrawal—(1) If you construct roads southward of Chitral to lead to it you make pervious what was impervious, and in that way you add, not to the security, but to the insecurity, of our Indian Empire. (2) After the conclusion of the Pamir agreement with Russia the retention of a military post at Chitral might be considered a menace, to be met by Russia by some similar move. (3) "You are breaking faith with the people among whom your campaign has

taken place. Do not believe that these mountain tribes, because they are savage, are unaware of the binding obligation of a declaration so clear, so specific, and so honourable as that contained in the proclamation." (4) The financial position of India.

What Lord Northbrook says as to the subsequent behaviour of some of the tribes concerned does not in the least affect the force of the third of these propositions. Lord Salisbury's Government, when they adopted the unfortunate decision to reverse the policy founded on these four grounds, never proposed that the construction and maintenance of the road was to be conditional or contingent upon the assent of the tribes. To make and to hold the road, with or without the consent of the tribes, was the essence of their new policy. The tribes, therefore, had to choose between forcible resistance—at that moment a hopeless undertaking—and acquiescence, and for the time they acquiesced. Then, at the first available moment, they showed what acquiescence really amounted to. I find nothing whatever in the Parliamentary paper referred to by Lord Northbrook (C. 8,037, 1896) to shake the opinion expressed by Sir Henry Fowler (September 3, 1895) that peaceful arrangements in any solid sense were not possible. On the contrary, what that paper seems to show is, first, that the Government decided to make the road with the co-operation of the tribes if possible; but, if not, then without it. Secondly, that the peaceful nature of the arrangements was in the highest degree dubious, if, indeed, it was ever dubious at all. I rather think that correspondents of your own have informed us that even while the road seemed to be going forward smoothly, there was always "a large discontented section" of the population looking sullenly on. This is obviously the meaning of the repeated requests of the Khans, when making these agreements, that the Government should help them with troops to keep the road open, "so that they may be protected from disorder created by their neighbours, and by their own factional disputes" (p. 23). Thus certain Khans say that the presence of Government troops is necessary "to give us protection and safety from other tribes, because, owing to our having rendered services to Government since the arrival of troops in our country, there is apprehension of other tribes being displeased with us and of their causing injury to us. We heartily request that Government may not leave our country. By the presence of troops we will get assistance for the protection of the road from Peshawar to Kashkar" (p. 27). There are other cases of the same sort. Is this the kind of thing that we are to understand is meant by making and maintaining a road by peaceful arrangements with the tribes? With all respect to Lord Northbrook, I submit that on each point the Parliamentary Paper makes rather against him than for him.

The construction of the proclamation is only one among other elements in the discussion of the mischievous reversal of policy in 1895, and neither Mr. Asquith nor I have treated it as more. But to leave it out as Lord Northbrook wishes us to do, is to omit what we judged two and a-half years ago, and judge just as strongly now as then, to be one of the material parts of the case.

Yours faithfully,

October 18.

JOHN MORLEY.

LORD G. HAMILTON'S INACCURACY.

Under the odd conundrum "The Road to Chitral: When did it Become a Breach of Faith?" the *Times* of October 21 printed the following letter from Lord George Hamilton:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

Sir,—An attempt to justify the charge of bad faith advanced in such unequivocal terms by Mr. Asquith and Mr. Morley against the present Government for assent-

ing to the construction by the Indian Government of a road to Chitral is made in a letter from Mr. Morley to the *Times* of the 19th inst. In that letter he makes two assertions—first, that the late Government objected to this policy because it broke faith with the tribes, and so informed the Government of India; secondly, that the present Government determined to make the road, in the teeth of the proclamation, whether the tribes objected or not.

Both these statements are, as anyone who reads the official correspondence can see for himself, the exact opposite of what did occur. No such communication was made by the late Government to the Viceroy, and the only allusion to the proclamation is one from myself, in which, whilst assenting to certain of the proposals of the Government of India, I added the mandate, "Do nothing to infringe in any way terms of proclamation."

The policy involved in the construction of the road is a subject of legitimate difference of opinion; the question of honour is one of fact.

I remain yours faithfully,

GEORGE HAMILTON.

Wortley Hall, Sheffield.

MR. MORLEY'S REJOINDER.

Mr. John Morley wrote to the *Times* of October 22 the following rejoinder:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

SIR,—Lord George Hamilton has not done me the honour to read my letter accurately, or else he would hardly reply so very wide of the mark.

1. He says that I assert that the late Government objected to the new Chitral policy because it broke faith with the tribes, and so informed the Government of India; and he describes this double assertion as "the exact opposite of what did occur." As for the first of these two propositions, it is enough to remind Lord George Hamilton of Lord Rosebery's public statement in the House of Lords (August 15, 1895), in which he expressly mentioned breach of the proclamation as one of our four grounds of objection to the new policy. Is their any doubt or mystery about this? As for the second proposition, it is not in my letter. As I said in the speech at Arbroath which opened this controversy, the despatch embodying the decision of the Cabinet and the grounds for it was not sent, for the very good reason that the Government were, at the very moment, overthrown by an adverse vote in the House of Commons. What I wrote is the full and precise truth. Lord George Hamilton's letter is headed, "The Road to Chitral, when did it become a breach of faith?" My answer is that the late Cabinet decided that the failure to withdraw would be a breach of faith, as soon as ever the question came before them for determination.

2. The Secretary of State challenges my assertion that the present Government determined to make the road with the co-operation of the tribes if possible, but if not, then without it. This also he declares to be the exact opposite of what did occur. Does he really deny that, just as I said, to make and to hold the road, with or without the consent of the tribes, was the essence of their new policy in July, 1895? Does he assert that, when he defended the project of the road in Parliament (September 3, 1895), he intended the making of the road to be contingent on the goodwill of the tribes? When the Government of India told Sir R. Low (August 10, 1895) that a garrison would be retained in Chitral territory, and that it was intended to hold the road from the Swat river to the border of Chitral by means of levies, was that conditional on anybody's assent? The Indian Government directed the General (August 15, 1895) to point out to the tribes that while Government consider that the opening up of the road "is necessary" to secure the prevention of any future aggression on Chitral

territory, "they are willing and anxious to do what is necessary in co-operation with the tribes." Did this mean that if the tribes did not fall in, the project, which was described as a necessity, would be dropped or postponed? If Lord George Hamilton can give no good answer to these questions—and it is notorious that he cannot attempt it—the interpretation placed by my letter upon the Ministerial policy, as shown in papers and speeches, so far from being the exact opposite of the truth, is incontestable. "I could not help smiling," said Lord George (September 3, 1895), "when I heard Sir Henry Fowler denounce the construction of roads." "I believe this road," he went on, "if the negotiations are properly conducted, will place our relations with the tribes on a better footing than before." *O pectora cæca!* Decidedly, I think, one of the most foolish Parliamentary smiles to be found in all "Hansard."

Yours faithfully,

JOHN MORLEY.

October 21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

OCTOBER, 1897.

BADMINTON MAGAZINE. St. Clair, Col. T. S., "The Griffin in India."

BANKERS' MAGAZINE. Schmidt, Hermann, "The Indian Currency Position."

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. "The Native Proes in India."

BOARD OF TRADE JOURNAL. "The Cotton Fabrics of Bombay."

CASSIER'S MAGAZINE. Wallace, John, "Primary Technical Education in India."

CORNHILL MAGAZINE. Vibart, Colonel E., "The Sepoy Revolt at Delhi, May, 1857" (continued).

JOURNAL OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE. "Condition of Agriculture in India."

NATIONAL REVIEW. Low, Lieut.-General Sir Robert, "The Indian Frontier Risings."

NINETEENTH CENTURY. Vibart, Sir Lepel, "The Breakdown of the 'Forward' Indian Frontier Policy." Ahmad, Moulvie Rafuddin, "A Moslem's View of the Pan-Islamic Revival."

POSITIVIST REVIEW. Beesly, Edward Spencer, "The Indian Frontier War."

Cheap Edition of Kaye and Malleeson's Indian Mutiny.

SILVER LIBRARY EDITION.

6 Vols., Crown 8vo. Price 3/6 each.

HISTORY OF THE INDIAN MUTINY OF 1857-8.

BY

SIR JOHN KAYE, K.C.S.I., F.R.S.,

AND COLONEL MALLESON, C.S.I.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of Magdalen College, and Secretary of the Appointments Committee in the University of Oxford, acts as Guardian to persons coming to England for Education, and gives information as to the methods available of Education, General and Professional. Address Secretary, INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools), 44, High Street, Oxford, England.—(Advt.)

Printed by A. BOWEN, 1 & 2 Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, E.W.]

VOL. VIII., No. 12
(NEW SERIES)

DECEMBER, 1897.

Subscription Post Free
Six Months 7s 6d
IN INDIA, SIX RUPYAS

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	353	Mr. Tilak's Application to the Privy Council ..	371
Indian Cultivators—In Bengal and out of Bengal, by Ramesh Chunder Dutt, C I E	360	Sir H. Fowler Breaks Silence	372
Land Revenue Enhancements in the Bombay Presidency, by the late Javerlal U. Yajnik	361	The Public Debt of India	374
Mr. Tilak's Application to the Privy Council: Some Im- pressions	364	"England and India": Mr. R. C. Dutt's book ..	376
The Detention of the brothers Natu	365	Mr. Courtney on Indian Administration	378
London Indian Society's Dinner: Speeches by Sir W. Wedderburn, M P, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji ..	366	The "Forward" Frontier Policy: Sir H. Fowler at Last	379
Future Trans-frontier Policy	369	The late Mr. J. Dacosta	383
		Reviews: British Moralists of the Eighteenth Century ..	383
		The Indian Mutiny	384
		Mr. Kipling's New Book	384

NOTICE.

With the present number of INDIA, there are issued gratis (i) a full report of the proceedings of November 19 before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak and (ii) a title-page and analytical index to INDIA for the year, January-December, 1897.

Indiana.

WE discuss elsewhere the chief question involved in the proceedings of November 19 before the Judicial Committee. But there are some further points which may be conveniently dealt with here. One sees in the comments of newspapers upon the case the frequent use of the phrase "Mr. Tilak's articles." But the incriminated matter was not Mr. Tilak's own work, and was not "articles" in the usual sense of that term. (One of the two "articles" was an ordinary report of a meeting—the Shivaji coronation festival. The other was a set of verses sent in by a contributor. Between the two there was printed a leading article on the Diamond Jubilee which, as Mr. Justice Strachey admitted, was unexceptionable in tone. This article was written by Mr. Tilak, and was his only piece of work in that issue of his paper. The judge in his summing-up dwelt at some length upon an alleged state of unrest and popular excitement in Poona at the time when the incriminated matter was published. But,

as Mr. Asquith showed, there was not a tittle of evidence before the Court as to any such state of affairs, nor is there any information anywhere that points to it. The plague operations, which undoubtedly gave rise to some excitement at Poona, had practically ceased a month before the date in question. Of course nobody supposes that Mr. Tilak would have been prosecuted if the Poona assassinations had not taken place. But no attempt was made by the prosecution to connect the murders with the publication of the incriminated "articles," and it is to be noted that whereas the "articles" appeared on June 15 Mr. Tilak was not arrested until July 27. The arrest was admittedly made with the sanction—which is perhaps another way of saying at the suggestion—of the Secretary of State. The sentence of "rigorous" imprisonment is unusually severe in such a case and, after the refusal of the Privy Council to interfere, it is not surprising that Mr. Tilak is reported to be preparing a petition to the Government for clemency.

THE Lord Chancellor, in announcing the material part of the decision of the Judicial Committee, stated that in their lordships' opinion "no case had been made out consistently with the rules by which their advice to her Majesty had been guided hitherto in giving leave to appeal in criminal cases." What are those rules? They were stated in the course of the proceedings (1) by Mr. Asquith and (2) by Mr. Cohen. Mr. Asquith cited what was said in *The Queen v. Bertrand* as

Mr. Tilak's
Application.

The Discretion of
the Privy Council.

to the limits within which the Judicial Committee would exercise their discretion :—

It is not necessary, and perhaps it would not be wise, to attempt to point out all the grounds which may be available for the purpose; but it may safely be said that where the suggestions, if true, raise questions of great and general importance, and likely to occur often, and also where, if true, they show the due and orderly administration of the law interrupted or diverted into a new course which might create a precedent for the future, and also where there is no other means of preventing these consequences, then it will be proper for this Committee to entertain an appeal if referred to it for its decision.

Could there be a more apt description of Mr. Tilak's application? Does not Mr. Justice Strachey's remarkable interpretation of the law raise questions of great and general importance, likely to occur often? Does it not divert the law into a new course which will certainly create a precedent for the future? And is there any means of preventing these consequences other than the intervention of the Privy Council? Or turn to the rule stated in *Re Abraham Mallory Dillet* and cited by Mr. Cohen :—

Her Majesty will not review or interfere with the course of criminal proceedings unless it is shown that by a disregard of the forms of legal process, or by some violation of the principles of natural justice, or otherwise, substantial and grave injustice has been done.

Observe the words "or otherwise." One would think that they might suitably include a case in which an inexperienced judge, administering an unfamiliar law, had gravely misdirected an alien jury.

THE appearance of Mr. Asquith as leading counsel for Mr. Tilak in the application to the Privy Council provoked an amazing rebuke from the *Times*, which closed its first leading article on November 22, with these awe-inspiring words :—

A fine sense of delicacy in these matters does not appear to be one of the characteristics of Mr. Asquith. The appearance, even before an appellate Court like the Privy Council, of a member of the late Cabinet as counsel for a person convicted of seditious practices in India, is certain to lead to misconception among our Indian fellow-subjects.

The obvious retort to this bit of Pecksniffian criticism was supplied in the *Westminster Gazette* of November 24 :—

"The attack," writes a correspondent, "to which reference has been made in the *Westminster Gazette*, of the *Times* on Mr. Asquith for appearing as counsel for Tilak, having regard to the fact of his having been a member of the late Cabinet, becomes more grotesque when we remember that Lord Halsbury, who sat as one of the judges in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, is a member of the Cabinet which actually directed the prosecution of Tilak. Last July, Lord George Hamilton, in reply to Mr. Michael Davitt, admitted that the prosecution of Tilak had been advised by him as Secretary of State for India, and in a matter of such moment it may be safely assumed that Lord George Hamilton acted on the advice of the Cabinet. The Indian authorities did not intend to prosecute Tilak, who, after the publication of the articles on which the prosecution was founded, was elected a member of the Bombay Legislative Council. The Governor of

Bombay, who by virtue of his office is empowered to veto the election, took no steps to invalidate the popular selection."

The coolness of the *Times* is delightful. The Lord Chancellor was under no obligation to be present. But on what grounds was it open to Mr. Asquith to decline his brief—and to deprive Mr. Tilak of his services?

WITH reference to the case of the brothers Nattu, a well-informed Indian correspondent writes :—"A case of greater hardship and injustice it would be difficult to conceive, and it is scarcely credible that proceedings of such extreme severity, marked by such utter disregard of the ordinary forms of law, could be possible in any civilised country. These two brothers belong to a wealthy and highly respected family holding a position of great influence in the Deccan. Their ancestors rendered most valuable and loyal services to the British Government, and were rewarded with grants of villages and other marks of confidence and honour, and the family have always shown loyalty and devotion to the British Government. One of the two unfortunate brothers held the high position of a first-class Sirdar of the Deccan. For some time past the brothers have taken a more or less active part in the more important social and political movements in the Deccan and thereby, it is believed, incurred the displeasure of some of the more intolerant officers of Government. Early on the morning of July 26 last, those two men were suddenly arrested by the police in their house in Poona, without any cause being assigned, and marched to the railway station escorted by mounted policemen. One of them was thence conveyed to Ahmedabad, and the other to Thana, whence he was removed to Bhag. Both of them have since been detained in goal as political prisoners, and the whole of the family property—moveable and immoveable—has been attached and seized by Government, and placed under the control and management of the Collector of Poona. No charge of any kind has been formulated against them. No information of any kind has been vouchsafed to them as to the reasons which led Government to adopt such extreme measures against them. No attempt has been made to put them on trial or to hold any sort of enquiry, and there is nothing to show how long they will be detained in goal. The repeated applications of their legal advisers to be permitted to see them for instructions for a petition to be presented to Government on their behalf have been refused, and their own oft-repeated enquiries as to the matter charged against them, and the nature of the evidence justifying the extraordinary procedure adopted against them, have similarly remained unheeded.

These proceedings, so wholly repugnant to our sense of justice and fair play, and so utterly opposed to the principles and form of all civilized jurisprudence, have naturally created the greatest alarm and dissatisfaction throughout the country, and these feelings have been intensified by the persistent refusal of Government to allow the Natus an opportunity of vindicating their innocence and meeting the case alleged against them. Soon after their imprisonment a grave hardship was put upon one of them by the withdrawal of his Brahmin cook, and the compelling him to cook his own food, which he was unable to do, and it was not till after a remonstrance had been made that this oppressive order was withdrawn. Nor is this all. Government have thought it right and proper to decline to attend to any communications except from the prisoners themselves. At the same time they have been denied any sort of legal help and advice, and up to the present moment they have been kept utterly in the dark as to the case, if any, against them. It is currently believed, however, that they are suspected of some kind of complicity in a conspiracy which is supposed to have led to the deplorable murders of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst in Poona, June 22. Lord George Hamilton, in the course of his speech in the House of Commons on August 5, announced that the arrest of these men was expected to unravel the supposed conspiracy. This may presumably be taken as a deliberate and authoritative pronouncement as to the reason of the arrest and detention of the two brothers, and this brings us to the question of the legal sanction for the proceedings taken against them by Government. The arrest of their persons and the attachment of their property have been effected under the provisions of an antiquated Act (Regulation xxv, of 1827) the continuance of which on the Statute book is discreditable to the traditions and feelings of a civilised nation. It empowers Government for certain reasons of State summarily to arrest and imprison persons believed to be guilty of the offences set out in the Regulation, and to attach and seize their lands. It is plain that a law of such exceptional severity ought to be put in force only under circumstances of the gravest public danger, and on reasonable apprehension that such danger could not be met or averted by any less drastic means. Equally clear is it that the Regulation was intended for turbulent times and circumstances menacing the peace and safety of the country. It is not difficult to see that none of these conditions exist in the present case, and that the enforcement of the Regulation against two peaceful and respected citizens of Poona like the Natu brothers, in such times of profound peace, has been in the highest degree impolitic and unjustifiable.

But apart from general considerations, the measures of Government are indefensible even on technical grounds. The Regulation itself specifically defines the reasons of State for which alone its provisions can be put into force, and, shortly stated, these reasons must affect the relations of the British Government with foreign powers or allied native States, or imperil the safety and tranquility of the empire. It is preposterous to suppose that these two private individuals could be guilty of any such serious offence, and it is intolerable that such a stringent law should be put into motion only in the hope of discovering evidence of an ordinary offence, amply provided for by the ordinary laws of the country. The House of Commons was definitely informed by the Secretary of State for India that the arrests were made with his sanction, and only in the expectation of a supposed conspiracy for the perpetration of the foul murders of the night of June 22 being thereby brought to light. This is not one of the reasons of State warranting resort to the Regulation of 1827, and no one can be safe if the un-English machinery of such an Act is to be put into force for purposes of terrorism, and on the strength of information probably supplied by one's enemies behind one's back, and of the very nature of which he is ignorant.

Palpable Illegality.

"THE proceedings of Government regarding the attachment of the property of the family are similarly marked by palpable illegality, and it is difficult to avoid the conviction that this step was calculated, even if it was not intended, completely to paralyse the unfortunate men, by depriving them of all means of making their defence. The property is of very considerable value, and the family has been accustomed to a style of living in comfort and ease, and yet the only provision made for their support and maintenance by the Government out of the property is the miserable allowance of Rs. 250 (£15) per mensem in the case of one of them, and of Rs. 200 in the case of the other. What makes the proceedings still more oppressive and unjustified is that the property is the joint property of an undivided Hindu family, of which a third brother, against whom nothing is alleged, and who is not one of the suspects, is a member, and in which, therefore, he is interested to the same extent as the suspects. But this is not all. The Regulation does not warrant or contemplate the seizure of personal property at all, and yet every item of such property too has been sequestered and placed in charge of the Collector of Poona, who has promptly given notice to all bodies holding any property of the family not to part with any portion of the property to any member of the family. It is probable that Government have rendered themselves

liable in heavy damages for their illegal and arbitrary action, and it is to be hoped that the legality of the proceedings will be made the subject of judicial investigation at an early date. It is necessary to add that there is no pretence now for the detention of these persons, whatever excuse there might have been at an earlier stage of this extraordinary case. The murderer of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst has, it seems, been discovered, and has made a circumstantial confession, which wholly and absolutely absolves the Natus of any sort of complicity or knowledge. They are prepared to stand any trial or investigation which the Government may order, and they have repeatedly courted it, nor is it unreasonable to suppose that if the Government had any evidence in their possession worthy of the name, they would by this time have given some indication of it or taken action thereon against the prisoners. These are the facts of the case which cannot be disputed and I appeal to the sense of justice and fair play of the British public to make its voice heard, to secure the liberty of these unfortunate men."

THE Queen's Proclamation of 1858, which the people of India regard as the charter of their rights, declares that her subjects of whatever race or creed shall "be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity, duly to discharge." Why do the servants of her Majesty endeavour so often to falsify their Sovereign's promise? The "Mahajana Sabha" or "People's Association" of Madras brings a most important case of this kind to public notice. The rules for the admission of the natives of India to the Engineer class of the Thomason Civil Engineering College at Rurki appear to have been so modified in the present year as to exclude the true natives of India. The rule for 1896 was that,

Candidates for admission to this Class must be statutory natives of India, and not under 17 or above 21 years of age at date of entry to College.

The rule for 1897 is that,

Candidates for admission to this Class through the entrance examination must be statutory natives of India, other than Natives of pure Asiatic descent whose parents or guardians are domiciled in Bengal, Madras and Bombay, and must not be under 17 or above 21 years of age at date of entry to College.

The italics are our own. What does this mean? Are young men of "pure Asiatic descent" excluded from qualifying themselves as Engineers in India through this Government institution because they are of "pure Asiatic descent"? We wait for further information. The Queen-Empress of India and the English people should know how the Queen's pledges to the people of India are kept.

Another Example.

ANOTHER glaring instance of disqualification of Indians of pure Asiatic descent is brought to our notice by Indian papers lately received in England. The post of Engineer-Secretary to the Patna Municipality was created and sanctioned by the Government of Bengal by a recent order. The Municipal Commissioners selected for the post Mr. P. O. Mukerji, an L.C.E. of Bombay University, who had had long experience in respect of drainage and water-works. The Divisional Commissioner, however, has negatived the selection for a reason which may be stated in his own words.

What is required is a competent man who is neither Behari nor Bengali, Hindu or Muhammadan, and who can keep himself aloof from party influence. Obviously a good European officer is the only man who could fulfil these conditions.

We can scarcely conceive that a high English officer, and a Bengal Divisional Commissioner, should use such an argument. The whole population of India could be disqualified for all appointments in India by the use of such reasoning, and the Queen's Proclamation would become a delusion—a paltering with the people of India in a double sense, "keeping the word of promise to their ear and breaking it to their hope."

A Study in Confusions.

A CORRESPONDENT writes:—Pity at times is a sacred duty, most sacred when most unwelcome. It is easy to pity those who want your pity, but it is hard to thrust your compassion upon those who resent it. Yet you should not shrink from the task. Your ruth should be resolute, implacable. At all costs, pour it over the red-hot anger of the person to be pitied until it hisses itself into silence. The forlorn misery of the Tory Press and the Tory party in regard to the blunder of Chitral is a case in point. Their public agony is almost indecent. They advertise their distress at every corner. It is a kind of political epilepsy. Do not pass them by without stopping to straighten the spasmodic limbs and to sponge the contorted features. It is a sacred duty to pity them in spite of their demurring violences. They have made so very much worse a case which already was so very bad. Tory calleth unto Tory, Minister unto Minister, Editor unto Editor, until the sky is dark with apologies. "Our party, right or wrong," they mutter, as they launch a new solecism or forge a fresh fallacy. As the tide of war ebbs and flows in the wild regions far beyond the border, John Bull reaches for his whip. The culprits deafen him with exculpations, disavowals, subterfuges, sophistries, and nervously watch his fingers tightening round the butt. They have felt his lash of old, and now they tremble with fear deferred. It is your sacred duty to pity those

objects. . Mr. Balfour (Norwich, November 4) taunts the Liberals because they attack Lord Elgin, while Lord James (Ramsbottom, October 25) taunts them because they do *not* attack him. If either be right, the other is wrong. So do the great, wise, and eminent ones cancel each other! But the pangs of the leaders are nothing in comparison to the pangs of the leader-writers, doomed to follow every gyration of every orator. The very *Globe* has tottered on its ancient axis. To wit:—

Lord Elgin's indiscreet undertaking was expressly made conditional on the friendly behaviour of the tribes towards the Chitral relief expedition. But that condition was flagrantly violated from the first. Unless, then, the Radical intellect conceives that a contract deliberately violated by one party still remains binding on the other, "Honest John" and his co-accusers had better cease their silly clatter about breach of faith.

It would be easy to show that this argument is wildly untenable, for in point of fact the tribes, trusting in the word of the British Raj, allowed the expedition to pass through their territories without any serious molestation. Lord George Hamilton, in his despatch of August 16, 1895, admitted that "the proclamation was not without effect." It is, indeed, obvious, in the light of recent events, that, if the tribes had opposed the "relief expedition," and forced it to cut its way to Chitral, the difficulties of the force would have been enormously increased.

A Case for Assortment.

BUT (our correspondent continues) we need not dwell on that point, for the *Globe* itself supplies the antidote to its own poison. Finding out the weakness of this position, it scuttles into another, if possible still weaker. It decides to make a scapegoat of Lord Elgin, who fortunately happens to be a wicked "Radical Viceroy":

The *fons et origo* of the whole controversy is, of course, the injudicious proclamation issued by Lord Elgin, a Radical Viceroy, whose appointment was in the first instance a scandalous political job, and who has more than once shown his unfitness for the responsible position which he holds by making promises to the natives which he has been unable to keep.

Here there is a distinct admission that the "promise" of the proclamation was not kept. Again:

A Viceroy whose promises are, like piecrust, made to be broken must inevitably involve his Government, sooner or later, in embarrassment and discredit.

The violation of the strict letter of Lord Elgin's foolish Proclamation was as nothing compared with the disgrace which would have attached to the English name through the abandonment of our helpless allies.

The arguments of the *Globe* may now be collated:

1. Lord Elgin violated the Proclamation;
2. Lord Elgin did not violate the Proclamation;
3. Lord Elgin was justified in violating it
 - (a) because certain of the tribes violated it, and therefore violation ceased to be violation, and
 - (b) because it was better to violate it than to abandon "helpless allies," who

had not violated it, to the vengeance of those who had violated it.

These are only a few of the contradictions into which the Forward school have fallen in their despairing efforts to shore up their rotten case. For instance, the *Globe* abuses the Viceroy as "indiscreet," "Jodiah," "unstatesmanlike," as "unfit for the responsible position which he holds," while Mr. Balfour declares that he is an "honourable and able statesman" who "deserves our sympathy and support." Is it not a sacred duty to pity a Party and a Press whose ideas are so hopelessly mixed? Nay, is it not the duty of every humane man to sort them and sample them and arrange them neatly in bundles in the shop-front of Toryism? These notes are only a humble instalment of that gigantic task.

It is worth noting that Lord James, "Tribes of Northern India," in the speech which is referred to above, described the tribes to whom the proclamation of the Government of India was issued as "the tribes of Northern India." "They were told," he said—we quote from the full report in the *Tory Manchester Courier*—"they were told that the Government had been guilty of a breach of faith and loss of honour in their dealings with the tribes of Northern India." Lord James does not appear to have seen how completely this description gave his case away—his case being, of course, that the charge of breach of faith was a partisan fabrication. The famous proclamation, dated March 14, 1895, was issued to the people of Swat and the people of Bajaur, and—an important point that is sometimes overlooked—"its purport" was "generally communicated upon the border." Now, as the proclamation promised among other things that the Government had no intention of "interfering with the independence of the tribes," it follows plainly that, if Lord James now correctly describes those tribes as "the tribes of Northern India," the proclamation has been violated. Lord James may plead that he is only following the bad example of the average sub-editor who permits himself to give to the telegrams such headings as "The Indian War," and "The War in India." But one expects a Cabinet Minister to be more careful about his words—even though he believes, with Mr. Long, that the brave tribesmen whom we are killing off are "rebels endeavouring to repudiate the authority and sovereignty of Great Britain."

Mortality from Famine.

THERE has lately been issued a further set of papers dealing with the "Famine and the Relief Operations in India," which brings the account down to May, or in some points to July last. Apart from the lateness of the

issue, the volume is so compiled as to give the impression that it is intended to confuse and dishearten the enquirer. On one or two points it is possible, no doubt, to glean definite information—such as the number of people on relief:

NUMBERS ON RELIEF. 1896-7.

End of each month—

Oct. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. Mch. Apl. May. June. July.
54 251 532 2,026 3,141 2,811 3,298 4,064 3,927 3,220
(in thousands.)

From October 1896 to June 1897, there was a fearful rate's progress, as the number on relief grew from 53,800 to 4,240,000. It has since been officially signified that the famine, or the need of special aid, is over. Yet here we find Mr. Fox-Strangways writing from the Central Provinces that

in October the early rice will give very general relief and will probably lower prices everywhere. The rabi sowings which will be taken in hand during that month, will further diminish the demand for Government relief. In November the remaining Kharif crops will be reaped, and after December it is generally expected that if the crops are normal, there will be little or no further necessity for direct famine relief.

So that it was not hoped that the famine would be gone until the New Year. And what of the mortality? The answer is that this curious volume does not tell clearly—even for the short period with which it deals. Nay more, there are fresh signs of the old distaste for the complete truth. Speaking of the district of Hoshangabad in the Central Provinces during March last, the Deputy-Commissioner writes: (p. 36.)

Deaths due to starvation.—There were 1,427 deaths during the month, of which 23 were due to cholera, 18 to small-pox. There were 18 deaths due to starvation verified by the police out of a total of 85 reported as due to privation, excluding the 110 deaths on relief works and in poorhouses.

To show the value of this confused statement, let us quote a passage on the same page respecting the Narsinghpur poorhouse, where

there were 124 deaths or a ratio of 128.09 per 1,000 during the month against 107, or a ratio of 137.49 per 1,000 in the previous month. Of these deaths, four cases were brought to the poorhouse in a moribund state due to want of food, three of them died the same day they were brought. In the case of 53 other persons that died, illness was induced by want of food, the sufferers having been brought to the poorhouse in a very emaciated condition. In the Gadawara poorhouse there were 73 deaths during the month, against 104 in the previous month. Of the 73 deaths, eight were due to want of food and 45 due to illness and diseases induced by want of food. During the month there were 26 deaths in the Chhindwara poorhouse against 25 in the previous month, with a death rate of 167.61. Of the 26 deaths, four were due to want of food, and 12 due to illness and disease induced by want of food.

These two excerpts are a specimen of that which is made to do duty for information.

ONE observes again the distinctions to minimize. A Disposition between death from "starvation" and "privation," and the wisdom which produces figures "excluding deaths on relief works and in poor-houses." The reporter from whom we have quoted says, referring to Seoni, (p. 27.):—

Deaths are put in class (a) where they were due to the entire want of food or to inadequate food for some days prior to death. They occur chiefly among wanderers in remote parts

of districts. In class (b) are put cases where, in spite of adequate and suitable food, death occurred in consequence of previous want of nourishment. Such deaths take place chiefly at poor-houses and at relief centres, and in the relief kitchens which are now attached to all large works.

What does it matter where the unfortunates died, whether in or out of doors, or how long or how short the time during which they were without food? They died, all of them, because of the famine. There seems to be a disposition throughout the reports to minimize the total mortality from famine. What is wanted is the truth, the whole truth, and that at this date it would be possible to give much more satisfactory figures is evident from the report from the Central Provinces, which are also the centre of the famine operations. At page 26, under the heading, "Mortality, deaths from starvation," we get the following table which "gives the total number of deaths and the death-rate (per mille per annum)" for the months of January and February respectively:—

DISTRICTS.	DEATHS.		DEATH-RATE.			
	Jan.	Feb.	Exclusive of Towns.		Inclusive of Towns.	
			Jan.	Feb.	Jan.	Feb.
Jubbulpore ..	5,807	6,839	80	102	107	114
Saugor ..	3,313	2,907	55	60	63	59
Damoh ..	1,740	1,417	—	—	64	52
Mandla ..	1,313	2,396	—	—	46	85
Seoni ..	1,948	1,621	—	—	63	52

Such a table errs through want of precision. All deaths are included and those due to famine cannot be distinguished. It would, however, have been practicable to construct a table from such figures as these, together with those showing the increased recourse to relief of various kinds, which might have served as a rough index of the effect of famine. Here and there, no doubt, we get a figure that is helpful, as when on page 80 we find that 912 persons died from privation during March in the Central Provinces. But we cannot tell how many died throughout India, and the "special death-rate return" on pages 223-231, though useful, is incomplete. It is not sufficient to give us percentages of deaths for several months for the various provinces. To interpret these it is necessary to compare them with the statistics of population, and to the ordinary mind the chief question is, not the ratio between deaths and population, but how many human beings have died in consequence of the famine. It is quite true that it is early to expect a complete return of the famine's ravages. But the public is entitled to far less haphazard information than is here afforded.

Who is responsible for this state of things? The whole Truth Wanted. The one comes from the top, and ideas filter down from above. This miscellaneous report supplies evidence that the want of information is largely consequent upon the form in which the schedules have been placed before subordinate officers. The Central Provinces were the sorest spots, and in writing from Simla, on behalf of the Government, Mr. T. W. Holderness

refers (on page 82) to the mortality returns of the month of March, 1897, as follows—

The number of deaths shown in column 16 of Statement A. as due to starvation is grievously large in five or six districts. But it is clear from the divisional and district remarks that the returns include deaths from unknown causes which have been attributed without sufficient evidence to starvation by the reporting agency. . . . more pains to secure correct classification, etc. . . . The Government of India think that further precautions are required to secure proper examination of the figures for each district before they are returned, and to exclude deaths from cholera or unknown causes.

Precisely. But as cholera and small-pox are endemic among the Indian people superfluous distinctions and classifications might have been dispensed with—and, above all, the number of deaths as well as the percentages might have been given. Common sense is as necessary as "pains in classification." That the Government is sensitive on the point, is clear from a letter which Lord Elgin sent to Lord G. Hamilton on April 28, in the course of which he says:—

As exaggerated statements as to the number of deaths occurring in India in the present season of distress not unfrequently appear in the public press it may be well to point out that the population of the Murwara Tahsil is only 173,000, of the entire Jubbulpore district 758,000, and of the Mandla district 339,000. An extraordinarily high death-rate in a small area for a portion of the year does not imply so great a destruction of life throughout India through distress as is sometimes assumed. We do not in any way seek to minimize the concern with which exceptional mortality in any area, however small, should be viewed, but we think that the relative proportion of things is sometimes lost sight of. In spite of wide prevailing scarcity and distress the present monthly death-rate of British India as a whole shows little excess over the normal.

It is quite apparent that the "proportion of things" is lost sight of. As for the reference to "minimizing" let the following passage from the same letter, be read in the light of the fact that the returns are as defective as we have indicated:—

In the North-West Provinces and Oudh, where from the first a very powerful staff has been at the disposal of the local government, where communications are excellent and all other circumstances are favourable, and where relief has been administered with the utmost completeness and thoroughness, the death-rate of several districts has been persistently over fifty per mille per annum, and this high rate is held by the local government to be sufficiently explained by the exceptional character of the year and by the severity of the distress, which the Government is striving by all the means at its command to mitigate. In the Central Provinces the difficulties of the situation are very much greater. It is not only a question of organising relief, but of inducing the people to avail themselves of it. The population is spare in many parts and the areas to be explored by the relief officer large and difficult of access. The wilder tribes are prone to wander and to subsist on unwholesome food. Much of the excess mortality in the Central Provinces has occurred in poor-houses and in relief centres, to which exhausted wanderers congregate or are consigned by the police and the relief officers. Immigration from Native States has now, it is reported, been greatly stopped, but in the past this has also swelled the poor-house population, and the mortality of poor-houses and relief centres. A good deal has also been done to induce the wild forest tribes to come to the relief works, and to accept other forms of relief. For these reasons we are disposed to think that the mortality may diminish in the immediate future, though should it continue, we should not consider that it necessarily implied a failure on the part of the administration. We have, as we have already said, taking the utmost care to satisfy ourselves that all that can be done to relieve the unavoidable privations of the people is being done by the Chief Commissioner and his officers.

We may leave this passage to tell its own tale. But

we appeal to members of Parliament in particular to support our reiterated demand for a prompt and full disclosure of the number of deaths due to famine. A satisfactory return can be prepared. It may never be complete in its enumeration, but satisfactory it can be made, and we ought to get it without any avoidable delay.

The recent Liberal victory in the Middleton division of Lancashire was by common consent won on the question of the "forward" frontier policy, and we are happy to say that the speakers and lecturers who co-operate with the British Committee of the Indian National Congress contributed in no small measure to this result. Many members of Parliament who took part in the bye-election were supplied with copious information on the "forward" policy by the British Committee, and two of the lecturers who regularly work with the Committee delivered upwards of thirty speeches during the contest, to crowded and appreciative audiences. The same lecturers also worked in the Barnsley division and in the Exchange division of Liverpool, where a large amount of "literature" was distributed on behalf of the British Committee—Congress reports, copies of Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee's great speech at Poona, reports of speeches by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and special numbers of INDIA. As we stated last month this important department of the work of the British Committee is being steadily developed, as the following circular, issued last month to the hundreds of branches of the National Reform Union and other associations, will show:—

NATIONAL REFORM UNION.

Telegraphic Address: "POLITICS, MANCHESTER."

50, HAWORTH'S BUILDINGS,
5, CROSS STREET,
MANCHESTER,
November, 1897.

INDIA.

DEAR SIR,

The events that are now taking place on and beyond the north-western frontier of India, and the certainty that the great burden which the present war will, if imposed on the finances of that sorely-tried and impoverished country, make its administration bankrupt, and engender much disaffection amongst the native populations, are matters on which the electors of Great Britain ought to be thoroughly informed.

I am therefore instructed by my Committee to urge upon all the Branches the importance of having lectures and meetings, at which speakers well qualified to deal with the subject of India, and its needs and difficulties, may address popular audiences.

On the Lecturing Staff of the Union are some such speakers, and the British Committee of the Indian National Congress are willing to co-operate with the Union in supplying other speakers. The services of these lecturers and speakers will be supplied gratuitously to any Branches that will get up meetings on the subject of India.

Please bring this matter before your Committee at an early date, and if they decide to hold a meeting, let me have two or three alternative dates which I may submit to the speakers for their choice.

Yours faithfully,

ARTHUR G. SYMONDS,

Secretary.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress is supplying part of the funds necessary for this campaign, and other public meetings are also being arranged.

INDIAN CULTIVATORS, IN BENGAL AND OUT OF BENGAL.

By ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Appendix to the Final Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture gives us some interesting information about Agriculture in India, in pages 92-95, which requires a passing notice. The information about India was supplied to the Royal Commission by the India Office, and the general conclusion which the India Office arrives at is that, "apart from drought and famine, Indian agriculture is not in a depressed condition." Unfortunately the condition of the agriculturist in India depends on other circumstances than merely the condition of agriculture, and even when there is no drought and no famine, the condition of the agriculturist is one of indebtedness and poverty in all Provinces of India outside Bengal.

The one circumstance which presses severely on the Indian peasantry (outside Bengal) is the excessive taxation on land, and the constant increase of this tax at every recurring revenue settlement. So long as the settlement officer is busy in raising the land revenue at each recurring settlement, any permanent improvement in the condition of the agriculturist is impossible, however much agriculture may spread and prosper.

Let us examine some of the figures supplied by the India Office to the Royal Commission. In the Punjab the land revenue increased in seven years, (1888 to 1895), from Rx. 2,111,000 to Rx. 2,382,000; increase, Rx. 268,000. In the Central Provinces the rental increased from Rx. 1,042,000 to Rx. 1,201,000; increase, Rx. 159,000. In the North-West Provinces the rental increased from Rx. 8,255,000 to Rx. 12,207,000; increase, Rx. 3,982,000. In other words, a short period of seven years witnessed an increase of land revenue by 12 per cent. in the Punjab, and of the rental by 15 and 48 per cent. in the Central and the North-West Provinces. Does any man in his senses believe that agriculturists in India can be prosperous under this system of constant and enormous increase of rental and land revenue?

Let us compare these figures with the figures for Bengal. In Bengal, which is permanently settled, the landlords have, according to the India Office, increased the rents about 19 per cent. in twenty-two years ending in 1895. In other words, the increase is about 6 per cent. every seven years. How does this compare with the increase of rental of 15 per cent. in the Central Provinces and of 48 per cent. in the North-West Provinces? The much abused zemindars of Bengal seem to be models of moderation compared with the State landlord in other parts of India, or with the petty proprietors who exact from the people in order to pay into the coffers of the State landlord.

There is an Act called the "Bengal Tenancy Act" in operation in Bengal. It restricts the power of landlords to enhance rents, and it confers the tenant-

right on the cultivators. It is, so far, the final legislation on the subject, and Bengal is indebted for it mainly to the labours of Lord Canning and Lord Ripon. Why is this excellent law not extended to the other provinces of India? Because (so the people of India universally believe) the Government as landlord does not desire to confer on its tenants those rights which it has conferred on the tenants of the Bengal zemindar; because (so the people universally assert) the Government as landlord desires larger enhancements of rent from its tenants than it will allow the Bengal zemindars to obtain from their tenants. I cannot myself believe that such objects could have influenced either the Government of India or the local Governments. But the difference in the law is patent, and the people cannot be blamed for accounting for it in the way they do.

And thus we are presented with two different agricultural pictures in India. In Bengal the rental increases about 6 per cent. in seven years; in the North-West Provinces and the Central Provinces it has increased 15 to 48 per cent. in the same period. In Bengal the peasantry are protected by the Tenancy Act; in the other parts of India the peasantry are not so protected; the State is the landlord and obtains enormous enhancements. In Bengal the money which is received as rent from the cultivators remains with the zemindars in the country, and is spent in fostering local trades and local industries, and in promoting education and various charities; in other parts of India the money received as rent from the cultivators is Imperial revenue, and mostly goes out of the country in frontier wars or in home charges.

Does anyone now wonder that there have been famines in other parts of India—six times within the sixty years of Her Majesty's reign—and that there has been no serious famine in Bengal within this period? I have elsewhere recommended the extension of Permanent Settlement to other parts of India; and I may be permitted to conclude this article by quoting one short passage from what I have elsewhere written.¹

It is a remedy (the Permanent Settlement) which was adopted in Bengal by Lord Cornwallis in the last century, which has saved the greater part of Bengal from famines, and has secured to the cultivators and landlords the increasing profits from the soil. It is a remedy which was extended to Benares by Lord Teignmouth towards the close of the last century, and which was proposed for all India by Lord Canning after the famine of 1860. . . . That this reform is urgently needed will scarcely be denied by unbiassed men. So long as fresh revenue settlements are made every thirty, twenty, or even fifteen years, securing an increase in the demand from the soil, it is idle to talk of improvement in the material condition of the people of India. A severe famine is devastating the greater part of India in the present year, but the settlement officer is still at his work. A large increase in the State demand has been obtained from the Central Provinces of India, and a large increase is expected in the Province of Orissa, where the settlement operations are now proceeding. It were well if the people of the Central Provinces and of Orissa were assured that this large increase is the last; that henceforward England desires the cultivators of India to reap the increase in the income from the soil. A permanent limitation to the State demand from the soil would be a fitting gift from their gracious Queen-Empress in this year of the Diamond Jubilee to the impoverished people of India.

¹ "England and India (1785-1885)." Pp. 134, 135.

LAND REVENUE ENHANCEMENTS IN THE BOMBAY PRESIDENCY.

BY THE LATE JAYERILAL U. YAJNIK.

To Sir George Wingate belongs the credit of introducing a land revenue system in the Bombay Presidency which has been in operation for more than fifty years. Sir George was associated in this work with Mr. Goldsmid, Secretary to Government in the Revenue Department, and Colonel Davidson, of the Survey Department. The principles upon which Sir G. Wingate framed his system were based on the consideration that the assessments of land should be as near its natural rent as possible; that any excess over this natural rent was tantamount to a reduction of what would go to form a profit and wage fund of the cultivator. His profits and wages were really the funds from which any addition to the capital and population of the country could be made. He believed that in an agricultural country such as the Deccan the general rate of profits or the usual reward of industry was regulated by that which the cultivator obtained from his soil. It was hardly to be expected, therefore, that as long as the cultivator in the Presidency, especially in the Deccan, remained in a depressed condition, any advances could be made by society in general. Impressed with this idea, Sir George Wingate, in dealing with the vital importance of the land assessment, never failed to dwell on the fearful consequences of an error on the side of over-taxation. "No unnecessary reduction can injure the country, and the Government revenue can only suffer from it to the extent of such reduction. An error upon one side involves the inevitable ruin of the country; an error upon the other some inconsiderable sacrifice of the finance of the State, and, with such unequal stakes depending, can we hesitate as to which should be given the preponderance? The line of true policy under such circumstances is not shown in an attempt to fix the assessment at what the land will exactly bear, but in fixing it as far within this limit as the exigencies of the State will permit." These principles of moderation in the assessment of land were worked out by Sir G. Wingate in the original settlement of the Deccan. Their results became evident during the currency of the settlement in a rapid extension of cultivation and in the condition of the peasantry. More land was taken up as the cultivator found that its cultivation would leave him a fair margin of profits, and Government revenue began steadily to increase. It was devoutly to be hoped that his principles, which were no other than those founded on economic laws applied to the condition of the country, would be followed in their integrity by his successors in revision settlements on the expiry of the original settlement leases. But it is by no means too strong language to say that in the revision settlements as worked out at the present day the principles which Sir G. Wingate constantly pressed on the attention of the Government of his day have been literally thrown to the winds, their place having been taken by rigid, grasping principles, whose object is the greed for revenue more than the welfare of the peasantry. The main object kept in

view is how best to screw out the uttermost farthing from the occupant of the land. It is the working of these rigid principles underlying specious arguments that is responsible in a large measure for the present depressed condition, the indebtedness, the want of staying power during a bad year, and the utter helplessness to pull through a year of scarcity or famine.

Sir George Wingate retired just about the time when the first taluka in Poona, namely, Judapur, was brought under revision. This revision showed a percentage increase of 53 over the collections of the last year. After Judapur, the talukas next settled were those of Sholapur and Mádha at an increase of 77 per cent., of Bhimthadi at 69, of Papat at 49, of Supa at 36, and of Jharmala at 32 per cent. The subject was brought to the notice of Government by the late Mr. Havelock, Commissioner of the Southern Division of the Presidency. He put up experimental farms on his own account, to test for himself how the incidence of the enhanced assessment pressed upon land. His practical study showed that the revision assessment pressed relatively more on the medium and the lower than the higher-classed soils. He attributed the result to the new classification, by which rates on land were raised. His view was that the rayat deserved every encouragement for the capital and labour expended by him on land which had been reclaimed or improved by the sinking of wells and by the conversion of dry-crop lands into rice or garden lands. Meanwhile, the collections of enhanced rates in revised talukas in 1873-74 showed that the number of notices served on rayats for recovery of arrears in Poona was 19,346, in Sholapur the number was 9,117; the number of cases of distraint was 302, and the balance outstanding was Rs. 86,620. In Poona the cases of distraint were 893, and the outstanding balance Rs. 20,623. In course of enquiries into the subject, the attention of Government was specially drawn to the following points:—

(1) The absence of free interchange of opinion between Settlement and Revenue Officers;

(2) The failure of the anticipation that prices would rise;

(3) The severity of assessment, demanding a limitation of enhancements; and

(4) The difficulty of realising the enhanced revenues, and the necessity of encouraging the rayats to make improvements by a liberal treatment of land newly brought under cultivation.

About this time a valuable note was published by Mr. W. G. Pedder, C.S., then chief Secretary to Government, on leading points regarding revenue settlements. The gist of it was that "the enhancements of assessment already made have undoubtedly been too great, and that Government might with advantage lay down, as a general rule, that the enhancements in a revision of settlement in the total demand on any taluka should not exceed 25 or 30 per cent." Mr. W. G. Pedder's opinion as a Settlement officer of many years' experience in Gujarat carried great weight.

Thus was brought about the famous limitation resolution of the Government of Sir Philip Wodehouse in No. 5739, dated October 29th, 1874, on

limitations of enhancements on revision settlement. The limitation orders are :—

(1) That the increase of revenue in the case of a taluka or group of villages brought under the same maximum dry-crop rate shall not exceed 33 per cent.

(2) That no increase exceeding 66 per cent. shall be imposed on a single village without the circumstances of the same being specially reported for the orders of Government.

(3) That no increase exceeding 100 per cent. shall in like manner be imposed on an individual holding.

The pledges held out by orders in this Resolution were repeated more than twice since 1871, but the Settlement Department has seldom heeded them. They have been usually violated. Government have gone on enhancing the assessment in revision settlements in utter disregard of them.

In 1876, the Deccan Riots Commission urged strongly upon the Government a policy of moderation. Two of the members of that Commission, namely, Sir Auckland Colvin, and Mr. W. C. Carpenter, held that the revised settlements of land in the Deccan were too heavy, and the method of assessment was faulty.

In 1879 the subject was brought for the third time to the notice of the Bombay Government by the Government of India in connexion with the Deccan Relief. Sir Theodore Hope admitted, in his speech introducing the Bill in the Viceregal Council, that "*to our revenue system must in candour be ascribed some share in the indebtedness of the rayat.*"

The fourth time that the Bombay Government had this question of moderation in enhancement brought to its notice was when the Secretary of State for India, Lord Cranborne (the present Lord Salisbury), had before him the proposal of the Bombay Government to retain the services of Colonel Anderson for a further period of six months, on the ground that the greater part of the dry-crop measurement and classification would require to be done again. The Secretary of State took the opportunity of drawing the attention of Government to the annoyance, harassment, trouble, anxiety and expense to the people which are inseparable from detailed re-measurement and re-classification of land at each revision of assessment. He urged that the rayats should be spared the trouble and annoyance of field operations and of more alterations in the revenue valuations of their lands, which the Government of Bombay described in 1877 as "a chief cause of irritation." He next drew attention to the element of uncertainty in the assessment of land revenue, and urged the practical difficulty of securing a proportionate equality of assessment under the law which requires that improvements made by the holders of land shall not be taken into account in revisions of assessment. The Secretary of State accordingly desired that there should in future be no general re-measurement or re-classification preliminary to a revision settlement.

The fifth time the Government of Bombay was moved to reconsider its land revenue policy was when Mr. Pollen, special Judge under the Deccan Agriculturists Act, informed Government (1) that the rayats were overburdened with an intolerable

amount of paper debt outstanding against them; and (2) that in average years an ordinary Deccan rayat does not gain enough from the produce of his fields to pay the Government assessment, and to support himself and his family throughout the year, so that really no margin is left for the payment of his debts.

The sixth time the Bombay Government was asked to reconsider its land revenue system was in 1883, when the Government of India asked it to report as to whether certain principles laid down for the guidance of the Government of the North-West Provinces in future revisions of settlement, could be made applicable to the Bombay Presidency. The two points to which the Government of India invited the special attention of the local Government were (1) that to avoid the trouble, annoyance and expense under the existing system of revision of assessments, the process of re-valuation of land should be eliminated in future from the scheme of land assessment, or, in other words, that, the agricultural value of land having been once ascertained with tolerable accuracy, that value should be taken as the basis for future assessment; and (2) that the future assessments of land revenue should be arranged under such rules, and in such a manner, as would enable proprietors of land to forecast with tolerable precision, and without official aid, the enhancement of revenue to which they would in future be subject. In replying to this communication, the Government of Bombay submitted a report from Mr. Stewart, the head of the Bombay Survey Department. The purport of Mr. Stewart's Report was (1) that re-measurement and re-classification were not contemplated in the Bombay system, and that after the present work had been placed on a satisfactory footing, no such operation would be necessary; and (2) that in order to place the work on a satisfactory footing in districts remaining to be dealt with, no general re-measurement or re-valuation was necessary. *Partial re-measurement and re-valuation would ordinarily suffice.*

It is necessary to understand what this partial system of re-measurement and re-classification is. This partial method utilizes, in the first place, the old measurements and classification in dry-crop lands which have undergone no change whatever in area or character of agriculture during the currency of the last thirty years' leases. Only such survey holdings are taken up for re-measurement and re-classification as have been broken up and converted into ruhi, rice, or garden plots, or which have been formed wholly out of alluvium, whether old or freshly deposited. One may judge of what is thought of this partial system by the rayats affected by it from a very significant phrase in which the peasantry in the Deccan, Konkan and Southern Maratha country describe it. The plain meaning of this phrase is that "he finds his crack of doom who has his survey number broken up" (*Gyádhá numar phootlá tyaché nasit phootlé*).

There are three notable features of this partial revision-system. The first is the introduction, for the first time, of an entirely new factor in the valuation of soils in classification work, called the "general position class," which carries with it a tremendous

power of enhancement; the second is a raising of the maximum rates for dry-crop, rahi, rice and garden lands; and the third is the tendency to limit the groups in classification work, and to reduce the many-group system to the one-group system. These three features have been an integral part of the new method of working out the partial system ever since the law to exempt improvements from taxation came into force. The system has been designed expressly to counteract the effects which might be produced by exemption of improvements from taxation. Public confidence in the Bombay Presidency in the work of the Survey Department has been greatly shaken by the notorious taxation of improvements in past and current settlements, in spite of the statutory provision in regard to their exemption. This provision, though loosely worded, had a place in sec. 30 of Act 19 of 1855, and subsequently in the Land Revenue Code, Bombay Act V, of 1879, but a doubt having been expressed as to its meaning, the Government of Bombay passed an Act (Act 4, of 1885) which provided that assessments should not be increased on revision on account of increase in the value of land due to improvements and effected in such land during the currency of any previous settlement by, or at the cost of, the holder thereof. The passing of the Act put a spoke in the wheel of the Survey Officer, and seemed for a time to encourage the rayats in the improvement of their land. But the operation of the Act has been rendered abortive by the ingenuity of the Survey Department in devising a scheme whereby the taxation of improvements is carried out in broad day-light under the head of lands enjoying the advantage of the general position class. This was at first designed to be used in soil classification only, but in Juhandesh it found application in the grouping of villages. In Amalner, for instance, all the 275½ villages were placed by one stroke of the pen in one group, at a maximum dry-crop value of Rs. 2. 12. 0. In Grandale all the 229 villages were placed under a maximum rate of Rs. 2. 10. 0. In Julgaon, all the 100 villages were put under one group with a maximum rate of Rs. 3. 4. 0.

Thus arose the battle of the one-group scheme against the many-group scheme. The argument of the Survey Department in favour of the one-group system was the similarity of the villages in each taluka in point of climate, communications, and proximity to good markets. The district officer, however, had regard to the effect which a wholesale uniform grouping would have on the villages of the old lowest groups, especially as compared with those of the highest, and which, it was believed, and believed very rightly, would press on the rayats for the whole period of the coming lease. Thus the unevenness of increases which would result in the different villages was at the root of the Collector's objections. The strongest condemnation of the uniformity of group system came from Colonel J. M. Ward, then Superintendent of the Deccan Survey. Referring to the plea put forward by the Survey Commissioner in defence of the system, he remarked: "I venture to submit that these words amount to a condemnation of the arguments which precede them in favour of a one-group scheme.

They contain an admission that the scheme is unscientific, and is recommended only that thirty years hence a fair starting-point may be afforded for survey settlement principles being once again taken into consideration. In the meanwhile, it is acknowledged that the old lower groups will suffer in comparison with those originally assessed at a higher rate." In deciding on the question the Government of Bombay sacrificed all argument and sound reasoning on the altar of uniformity. The climax was reached when the Bombay Government openly set at naught the Exemption of Improvement Act (Bombay Act V, of 1886), in their Resolution dated 30th August, 1888, on the revision of settlement of 116 villages of the old Jahalapur Petha of the Jharjat taluka. The passage in the Resolution worthy of note is the following: "It appears to H. E. the Governor in Council that all future questions of taxation of improvements should be avoided by assessing the land at once for its present and prospective capabilities, and recording the result as the standard assessment in the survey and village papers, the difference in the rate at which it may be considered advisable to levy at once being in the case of occupied lands treated as a remission during the period of the revised settlement, on the distinct understanding that at the next revision survey the full rate will come into operation, with such increase as may then be found to be justifiable, whether the contemplated improvement has been effected or not." After this, it is difficult to say whether finality in the assessment of lands will ever be reached under the Bombay land revenue system.

The chief points on the question of revenue enhancements I have tried to put forward here are:—

(1) That the original settlements introduced by Sir George Wingate in the Bombay revenue system led to extension of cultivation and improvement of the condition of the agricultural classes.

(2) That the Government of Sir Philip Wodehouse, desiring to avoid extreme increases on individual holdings, villages, and talukas, issued orders in 1874 limiting enhancements to 33 per cent. in the case of a taluka, 66 per cent. in the case of a village, and 100 per cent. in the case of an individual holding.

(3) That the expediency of exercising moderation in revision settlements was brought seven times to the notice of the Government of Bombay by high authorities but without any effect.

(4) That the partial method of re-measurement and re-classification of lands in revision settlements contains within itself the germs of a system of taxing improvements made at the cost of the labour and capital of the rayat in the conversion of dry-crop warkas, rahi, rice, and garden lands.

(5) That the statutory provision in favour of exemption of improvements by Act IV, of 1886 is rendered nugatory by the device of the general position class introduced for the first time in classification work, which assigns to position a value which is equal to that of soil and water.

(6) That this position class is made to do duty at at one time in classification, and at another time in working out the one-group scheme.

(7) That the one-group scheme as against the many-group scheme raised a controversy in which

the District Collector and one eminent member of the Survey Department took part and pointed out that the scheme was unscientific; but that Government sacrificed argument and reasoning on the altar of uniformity.

(8) That undue importance is attached to the position class in the new classification.

(9) And that the Jahalapur Petha Resolution is a warrant to all peasantry in the Presidency that all future questions of taxation of improvements shall be avoided by assessing land at once for its present and prospective capabilities, and recording the result as the standard assessment in the survey and village papers.

MR. TILAK'S APPLICATION TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

SOME IMPRESSIONS.

I.—HOW IT STRUCK AN ONLOOKER.

I have often heard of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but until Friday the 19th I did not know exactly what the words meant. They conveyed a vague notion only, like the expressions "the welkin" or "the situation." So as I made my way to Downing Street to see this mysterious body, I said to myself, "I shall see it as it is." Having done so, having gazed upon the Lord Chancellor in the flesh, I am bound to confess to a feeling of disappointment. The scene on that dull November morning was by no means impressive. The room in which the Committee sits is common-place and has not even the humble merit of being clean. The members of the Committee who were present, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Davey, Lord Hobhouse, and Sir Richard Couch, were not adorned with wig and robe, but sat there at a big table, looking very much bored, and if I may use the term without disrespect, looking also rather "stodgy." Indeed, those who are accustomed to attend the sittings of this Committee told me that the appearance of indifference on the part of their lordships was marked and unusual. As a rule they interrupt counsel with question after question, with arguments, and even with protests and contradictions. On Friday, during the two hours of Mr. Asquith's closely reasoned and masterly argument, scarcely a word was said by the four gentlemen who sat, head leaning on hand, and apparently only waiting for Mr. Asquith to finish in order to announce a decision already arrived at.

And who could help contrasting all this with the keen and even pathetic interest taken in the proceedings by some thirty of Mr. Tilak's fellow-countrymen who were standing at the back of the room following with strained attention every word of Mr. Asquith's speech. When he made a particularly good point—and he made many, some of them, as I thought, unanswerable—I noticed more than one of the native gentlemen present looking earnestly at the four apathetic old Privy Councillors, as if saying "surely that will impress them." And that little group of thirty or so, in the dull, drab room, were representatives of millions in that vast portion of the world called India. The surroundings seemed grotesquely unworthy of the far-reaching, almost measureless, consequences which depended upon the result of the appeal. To me by far the most interesting figure in the room was Mr. Bonnerjee, who, with his junior Mr. Blair, sat behind Mr. Asquith. I had heard of the tireless devotion and the splendid ability which Mr. Bonnerjee had given to the case, both as a great lawyer and an enthusiastic patriot.

I am not a lawyer, but even a layman could see the

force of many of Mr. Asquith's points, as he tore to pieces the remarkable summing-up of Mr. Justice Strachey. For instance, there was that amazing dictum that disaffection means the "absence of affection." Mr. Justice Strachey had claimed that this doctrine had been laid down by Sir Comer Petheram, but here he was wrong, for Sir Comer had spoken of that which is "contrary to affection." A man need not be learned in the law to see the monstrous injustice, and even stupidity, of punishing a man for the "absence of affection." This would mean that men are to be imprisoned for merely regarding the British Government in India with mild indifference! It implies that all those who are not prepared to fling up their hats and turbans and to sing psalms of praise, are liable to transportation. Again, Mr. Asquith made it abundantly clear that the judge had interpreted passages of poetry and flourishes of rhetoric in a dull, wooden, literal manner, that he had strained law against Mr. Tilak, and that there was ample reason why leave should be granted for an appeal. For it should be remembered that Mr. Asquith, and those associated with him, were not asking that the decision of the Court in India should be reversed. They were not asking that Mr. Tilak should be released. All they pleaded for was that leave should be given for an appeal against the sentence to be argued. That was all! And yet, after Mr. Asquith had for two hours put forth reason after reason, the opposing counsel for the India Office only uttered about a couple of sentences, the room was cleared, and in a very few minutes the Lord Chancellor declined to give leave!

The members of the Judicial Committee do not seem to trouble about giving many reasons for their decision, or at least they did not on this occasion. Nor can you tell, as you can in the Court of Appeal, whether there had been any difference of opinion. But I could not help thinking that surely so great a lawyer as Lord Davey, and so just an Anglo-Indian as Lord Hobhouse, must have regarded with some amazement not a few of Mr. Justice Strachey's dicta. And even the Lord Chancellor's few sentences in refusing the appeal did not contain any enthusiastic approval of the impugned summing-up. He declared that the summing-up was "of great length"—one remark in a highly controversial matter, upon which we can all agree—and then his lordship went on to say that we must look at it as a whole, and regard everything that was said in the light of what else was said. That is the old, old trick of the orator, or preacher, or writer who has uttered or produced an absurdity, and who always tries to escape by saying—"look at the context."

I have said that my experience of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is confined to its meeting on Friday, November 19. But those who know it well, lawyers who are often there, tell me that it is a very unusual thing for the Lord Chancellor to grace its proceedings with his presence. It is singularly unfortunate that he should choose to adjudicate upon a case in which he is interested as a Cabinet minister. I should be sorry to wrong his lordship, but there were not a few who regarded him as a politician rather than a judge when he turned up to listen (supposing that he *did* listen) to Mr. Asquith's arguments. Lord Halsbury has never shown any excess of scruple, any ultra-delicacy of feeling or super-sensitiveness. Indeed, to put it broadly, he is not likely easily to surprise any of us. But his appearance in that dull, dingy room in Downing Street did make some of the onlookers stare, and it made others who know his lordship well shake their heads, and say: "It's a bad omen for poor Tilak." And so it proved.

II.—BY A MERE LAWYER.

The Judicial Committee was undoubtedly fairly representative, consisting of Lord Halsbury, L.C., Lord Hob-

house, Lord Davey, and Sir Richard Couch. There seems good reason for the exception that has been taken to the presence of the Lord Chancellor, who is a member of the Government which authorised the prosecution. The story goes that the date of hearing was expressly arranged to enable him to sit. It would certainly have been much better if he had studiously stayed away. Those of us who know the judicial temper of the English Bench will not give any political weight to Lord Halsbury's presence; but it is only too obvious that a very different impression may readily prevail in India. It was, at the very least, unfortunate.

One of the most prominent characteristics of a case before the Privy Council is the extraordinary and persistent heckling to which counsel are always subjected. This was completely absent in the present case. Their lordships followed Mr. Asquith in absolute silence, broken only by one or two occasional remarks which carried very little significance. An outsider was heard to remark that they seemed to take it all without the least concern. A regular practitioner at the Bar of the Committee said that he had never seen such profound silence on the part of their lordships during an experience of a quarter of a century. Yet there was plenty of room for remark. The circumstance offered a very natural basis for the totally unfounded allegation that their lordships had come into the room with their minds made up in opposition to the application. This, too, seems unfortunate.

Mr. Asquith spoke to their lordships, not to the public. He was not at all well heard through the room. Of course, having to speak fully a couple of hours, he was wise to save his energies and his voice. Still, those who were familiar with the case were able to follow him. There can be no question that he presented all—or nearly all—the points with adequate force and lucidity. One would have liked to hear Mr. Bonnerjee follow him. The Committee hear only one counsel on such an occasion.

The Lord Chancellor announced the decision of their lordships in the barest possible form—adding, however, a strange *obiter dictum* on the judge's summing-up. The Committee did not think there was any reason sufficient to overbear the rule laid down by their lordships in such cases. It occurs to one that any such rule ought not to be rigid, but rather ought to be flexible. The uninstructed observer could not fail to be amazed at the decision, rule or no rule; and he could not but ask himself whether the spirit of the law were not sacrificed to the unessential wrappings.

I think myself that a good deal too much has been made of Mr. Justice Strachey's initial explanation of "disaffection" as the "absence of affection." It is wrong, of course; but, with the further equivalents—enmity, ill-will, etc.—the jury could not have been misled by it, for surely they were not exceptionally stupid men. But, as Mr. Asquith clearly insisted, Mr. Justice Strachey ought to have pointed out that the real test was in every instance the final expression of the illustration to Section 124A: namely, that the ill-will, enmity, etc., in order to amount to disaffection must be such as tended to excite active hostility to the British Government in the sense of endeavour to abolish or subvert it. The limited interpretation of "measures" was also a proper subject of objection; and Mr. Asquith showed that Mr. Justice Strachey had contracted the intention of the clause in a wholly unjustifiable manner, by restricting it to particular measures of particular kinds. Another very strong point, it seems to me, was Mr. Asquith's contention that the Explanation gives but a single example of multitudes of possible cases. By taking it as covering the whole section Mr. Justice Strachey undoubtedly perpetrated a most gross misdirection of the jury. It was also a very unhappy thing that such a case should have been tried in circumstances

where neither the judge nor the counsel nor two-thirds of the jury were capable of understanding the incriminated expressions in the original language—especially when the evidence on the translations was so completely unsatisfactory.

These are a few outstanding points. But they appear to be more than sufficient to satisfy any unbiased outsider that a rule which precludes the judgement of Mr. Justice Strachey from revision must be radically wrong. It is worse than useless to lay down a rule of legal procedure that lands the Court in conclusions which clash violently with the ordinary common sense of the public. Besides, it is not the English public, but the Indian public, whose common sense ought to be the measure of any such rule. Not all the judges who ever sat in this world would convince the Indian public, or any other public for that matter, that such grievous misapprehensions as those of Mr. Justice Strachey do not require correction and remedy. In India this view is, beyond everything, important. Our Empire there rests on the belief of the natives in the sternly unbiased justice of the English. But when a decision like this comes to them from the highest English tribunal, what can they say? And how can their objections be met? The political importance of this case is but too obvious. It is wholly deplorable.

THE DETENTION OF THE BROTHERS NATU.¹

FROM THE "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN."

The case of Mr. Tilak is not the only matter arising out of the troubles at Poona last summer which calls for notice. If Parliament were sitting we should have heard—or at least we ought to have heard—a good deal about the two brothers Natu who were arrested nearly four months ago, under the summary powers of a seventy-year-old enactment, and who have not yet been brought to trial. Some of the members of the present Cabinet are developing a curious habit, especially in the matter of the "forward" frontier policy, of shifting to the shoulders of subordinate officers in India the responsibility for decisions taken at home. But that expedient is out of the question in the case of the Natus. No sane person imagines that the Government of Bombay would have taken so grave a step except under instructions from the Secretary of State, and Lord George Hamilton, in a reply to a question of Mr. Michael Davitt's, admitted in the House of Commons on August 2 that his sanction had been obtained before the arrests were made. It may be well to set out a few dates in this episode. The Poona murders took place on June 22, and the Anglo-Indian press in India, promptly followed and encouraged by the Jingo press in London, fell into a great panic. On July 17 the Simla correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed home that "the worst possible effect" would be produced if a "policy of inaction" were "persisted in much longer." The phrase "policy of inaction" was explained in the next sentence: "No arrests have been made up to now of the persons concerned in the Poona outrages." On July 22 a telegram from Bombay announced: "Sir J. Woodburn, member of the Viceregal Council, has left for Poona." The "policy of inaction" straightway ceased. Five days later Mr. Tilak was arrested at Bombay, and the brothers Natu were deported from Poona. No charge was made against the latter, but under the provisions of the Bombay Regulation XXV, of 1827, they were detained during the pleasure of the

¹ This article appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* of November 16, under the heading: "The Poona Prisoners. From a Correspondent."

Government, and their estates were attached and placed under the management of the revenue authorities.

From that day to this neither the Government of India nor the Bombay Government has produced a tittle of evidence against them, nor given the slightest indication of an intention to bring them to trial. In the debate on the Indian Budget on August 5, Lord George Hamilton, replying to the criticisms of the Irish members, said that every Government in the world must have a reserve of power for times of emergency. That is a proposition which is not likely to be disputed. But a very great deal depends upon the mode in which such power is used. When the brothers Nattu—both of them prominent and wealthy citizens of Poona—were deported without trial it was assumed both here and in India that after no great lapse of time a charge would be formulated against them. The telegram from Bombay which announced the arrests said: "It is confidently expected that disclosures of an important kind will be one of the immediate results." The expectation was undoubtedly reasonable. But Lord George Hamilton may decline responsibility for expectations. In that case he may be referred to the words which he himself used in the House of Commons on August 5. "I believe," he said, "that the authorities at Bombay are within their rights in the action which they have taken, and that the result of the proceedings will be to unravel the plot which has been formed." Four months have passed, and no plot has been unravelled. On the contrary, a single individual has made to the police, and repeated before a magistrate, a confession as to the murders to which Lord George Hamilton referred. Yet the brothers Nattu are neither released nor brought to trial. This is a state of affairs which cannot be regarded as satisfactory by observers at home, and which is exciting profound indignation in India. The Government of Bombay may, of course, be in possession of grave evidence against their prisoners. But they render themselves liable to adverse criticism when, after the lapse of four months, they still give no sign of an intention to produce it. Lord G. Hamilton, in the speech to which we have already referred, spoke of the brothers Nattu as "notorious men." That was a strong epithet for a Secretary of State to use, and it is high time that he took the public into his confidence as to the precise meaning he intended to convey. At present, what is publicly known about the younger brother is, that some time ago he was tried and acquitted on a charge of rioting, and what is publicly known about the elder brother, who is a Sirdar of the Deccan, and one of the municipal commissioners of Poona, is that during the plague operations in that city he addressed to the collector a series of temperate and courteous letters, calling attention to acts of carelessness which he said he had witnessed. Those who are responsible for the government of India have passed and are passing through troublous times, which entitle them to every consideration on the part of their fellow-countrymen. But so far as the facts are known in the Nattu case, they give rise to great uneasiness, which hasty talk about plots and inaction certainly does not dispel. It is high time that the further facts, if any, were made known, or the suspects released.

With reference to the letters of Mr. B. R. Nattu to the Collector of Poona which were published in our last issue, the *Morning Leader* (November 3) printed the following leading article under the heading: "Is it English?"—

The current number of *INDIA* calls attention to a scandal in our treatment of Indian affairs which stands out with gross prominence, even among the many scandals with which Lord George Hamilton's administration has made us but too familiar. We know that there is a small and insignificant

though noisy clique in this country which regards all the natives of India as so many "niggers," who may be denied all semblance of justice with impunity. But this is not true, we are thankful to know, of the great majority of Englishmen. The average man, be he Liberal or Tory, is anxious that justice should be done to our fellow-subjects in India, and it is before this great fair-minded public that we wish to place the following facts concerning what is called the case of the Nattu brothers. When the plague broke out in Poona, nearly all the natives who could afford to leave left in a panic. The two brothers Nattu, gentlemen of high education, of great wealth, and of distinguished social position, remained. The elder of the two was known as a Sirdar of the Deccan and a Municipal Commissioner—that is to say, a man entrusted with great powers in local government. The two came forward as volunteers to assist the Anglo-Indian officials in stamping out the plague. Suddenly they were arrested, and under an obsolete regulation of 1827 were, without any pretence of a trial, without even any charge being made against them, deported. To-day they are still suffering imprisonment and are absolutely cut off from all communication with the outside world. The regulation to which we have referred gives the Government of Bombay the right to attach the immovable property of those deported—that is to say, to seize their landed estates. In this case, however, all the moveable property, consisting of jewels and hard cash to the amount of hundreds of thousands of rupees, has also been taken. And under this strange regulation there need not be any intention of ever bringing the men to trial, for, of course, there is no such thing as a Habeas Corpus Act existing in India. At the same time, when such powers were granted, the presumption, of course, was that while a responsible Government might during a crisis find it necessary to arrest and imprison Indian subjects, it would at some later date bring them to trial and produce evidence. But this is not Lord George Hamilton's way. He has openly acknowledged in the House of Commons that the arrests were made at his instigation. He said the two native gentlemen were "notorious." In what way? Their record is that the younger brother was once prosecuted and was honourably acquitted, while the elder brother has never been charged with any offence at all. To say that they are not one-tenth as notorious as Lord George Hamilton is a mild way of putting it. The cruelty which results from fear is proverbial, and when a feeble, incompetent creature like Lord George Hamilton is seized with panic, when he loses that which, for want of a better word, we must call his head, he sticks at nothing. These men have now been locked up for four months, and not a shred of evidence has been offered to justify their detention. Men are beginning to say in India that Russia could do no worse than this. Can any man here say that this is English treatment? We should either prosecute the men or let them go; and if we continue to do neither, the sooner we cease to brag about our national love of fairness the better. We as a nation have done great things for India in the past. We have sent some of the finest public men out there who have given the best years of their life to her service. Macaulay (one of the distinguished band) declared that we held India because our word was never broken and our justice was above suspicion. But just as a madman can in an hour destroy that which it has taken many a year to build, so a bewildered and incapable official like Lord George Hamilton, whose ignorance of India may be said to be co-extensive with the wisdom of Solomon, may in a few months undo all the good wrought by generations of able and devoted men.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY'S DINNER.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN ON THE WORK OF THE CONGRESS.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI ON "BRITISH RULE ON BRITISH PRINCIPLES."

The annual dinner of the London Indian Society was held in the Queen's Salon of the Holborn Restaurant, on Monday, November 1. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, President of the Society, was in the chair, and the company included Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart, M.P., Professor A. F. Marison, LL.D., Mr.

Bomesh Chunder Dutt, I.O.S., C.I.E., the Hon. D. A. Khare, Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. Edmund Russell, Mr. Moulvi Rafiqul Ahmed, Mr. Hassan Sherfudin Khali, Mr. H. Mullick, Mr. K. W. Bonnerjee, Mr. S. Z. A. Balkhi (Vice-President) and Mr. Balwant Singh (Hon. Secretary). In all 55 persons sat down to dinner. Letters of regret for unavoidable absence were read from the following among others:—Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Mr. H. J. Reynolds, O.S.I., Mr. J. Herbert Roberts, M.P., Mr. H. Morgan-Browne, Mr. W. S. Caine, and Mr. J. Seymour Keay. The proceedings were characterised by great enthusiasm throughout. A feature of the menu was a series of Indian dishes supplied by Messrs. Veerasawmy and Co. In the course of the evening the company was photographed by flash-light. After dinner,

The CHAIRMAN, Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI, who had an enthusiastic reception, proposed the toast of "The Empress and the Royal Family." He said that whether India's condition was that of joy or sorrow her Majesty always had a share in it, having always been deeply sympathetic with her Indian subjects. (Cheers.) What Indians wanted was British rule on British principles—(hear, hear)—and this demand was not a new one. The Queen in her gracious proclamation had given them that great gift, upon which they would always take their stand to demand their rights as British citizens. (Cheers.) Indians would never forget that great proclamation, which they owed to the Queen Empress personally, and which was the greatest gift that they had received from the British people. (Cheers.) Therefore he proposed the toast not as a formality, but in all sincerity. (Cheers.) He felt that the Queen had special claims to the respect, the attachment and the gratitude of her Indian subjects. (Loud cheers.)

The toast having been duly honoured,

Professor A. F. MURISON proposed the toast of "India and the National Congress." The past year, he said, had been for India a year of gloom—of plague, famine, earthquake, and war. Useful lives had been lost, business had been disorganised, the finances of the country had been dislocated, and many seeds of multiform evil had been sown. The plague had unhappily yielded an indirect outcome of much bitterness in Poona and Bombay. However great the credit justly due to the noble efforts of the officials to cope with the famine—(hear, hear)—yet there could be no doubt that still more beneficent results might have been reaped in the way of precaution, had the Government but listened to the wise recommendations of Sir William Wedderburn. (Cheers.) The monstrous perversity of the Frontier war—(shame)—would necessitate further loans in England, and hamper the Calcutta finances deplorably, with social results of a very far-reaching character. For judicious counsel in the depressing circumstances, where could one usefully turn but to the National Congress? (Hear, hear.) The policy of internal prosperity was the only possible means of salvation, and this policy the Congress had steadily urged in opposition to the insane waste of the treasure of India on Frontier fighting. (Cheers.) In conclusion, Dr. Murison urged the importance of remembering that the personal bearing of individual Indians in England must always count for a good deal in the formation of English opinion on the claims of India. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ROMESH CHUNDER DUTT, rising in answer to loud calls, responded for India. He said that in that year of disasters and calamities the thoughts of Indians naturally reverted to the earlier times when their country had played the part of an earthly providence—(hear, hear)—all the world over. (Cheers.) He dwelt upon the contributions which ancient India had made to the progress of civilisation, and said that to be a native of India was a matter for the highest pride. (Loud cheers.)

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, M.P., who was received with loud and prolonged cheering, replied to the toast of the Congress. He said he was glad to think that the name of the Indian National Congress was now known through the length and breadth of the land. (Hear, hear.) It was universally recognised as a great power, whether for good or for evil. They believed the Congress was a power solely for good; but it was most important that the British public should better understand what the Congress really was, especially that they should understand

what was its origin, and what functions it desired to fulfil. As regarded the origin of the Congress there was no doubt, and no mystery; for it was the natural and healthy offspring of the generous and enlightened policy, and especially the educational policy, adopted by the British nation towards India—(cheers)—a policy of trust in the people. (Cheers.) This spirit of toleration, of equity, and of benevolence, found a voice in successive Acts of Parliament, and in the ever memorable Proclamation of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen. (Cheers.) They could ask for nothing better. Thus it happened that those classes which accepted the boon of higher education became enthusiasts for British rule, and accepted the British Government not merely as a necessity, but as their National Government. (Cheers.) These sentiments originated among the people themselves, but they took definite shape twelve years ago through the labours and self-sacrifice of one man, Mr. Allan Hume—(loud applause)—the father of the Indian National Congress. Having accepted the British Government as the National Government, the object of the Congress party was to make that Government strong in the affections of the people. And for this purpose the function they desired to perform was that of interpreters between the rulers and the masses of the ruled, between the British people and the people of India. (Hear, hear.) Surely this ambition was a noble one, and a useful one. (Cheers.) Surely the offer of such help should be very welcome to the rulers upon whom rested the responsibility for the welfare of 300 millions of people, thousands of miles away, differing from themselves in language, race, and religion. Above all such help was necessary when this greatest of all modern problems was complicated by the calamities of war, pestilence, and famine. He believed that the British public would heartily welcome the co-operation of the Congress if they understood it better, and were satisfied that it was really representative in its constitution—(hear, hear)—that it was honest in its aims—(hear, hear)—and practical in its proposals. (Hear, hear.) Upon these three points he should like to say a few words. As regards its representative character they were aware that the delegates to the Congress were freely elected at public meetings held in every Province and Division in India, and that the endeavour was to include as far as possible every class and creed. No doubt the educated class formed the backbone of the movement; but this was a source of strength, not of weakness; for this class possessed the greatest influence, the whole subordinate administration of British India being in their hands, while they were the principal advisers of the Native States, and also practically monopolised the independent professions. Further this influence was in India strengthened by the caste system, under which there was excessive division of labour, and the priestly caste mainly did the thinking for the rest of the community while other castes respectively did the fighting, the trading, and the cultivation. Every effort was made to make the Congress representative—(hear, hear)—but if those who challenged its constitution would suggest any means or method by which more perfect representation could be secured they would gladly modify their system accordingly. (Cheers.) In the exemplary State of Mysore a similar popular assembly was utilised as the greatest help to a beneficent administration, and the necessary public machinery existed to make it fully representative. If similarly the British Government accorded gracious recognition to the Congress it would be joined by many timid well-wishers of British rule who were now unfortunately kept away by fear of official disfavour. (Hear, hear.) This would broaden the base of the Congress, while it would raise and mellow the tone of its deliberations. Secondly, as regarded the honesty of Congress aims, that was guaranteed by the profound belief of the educated classes that the true interests of India and Great Britain were identical. (Cheers.) The only alternatives to British rule were Russia or anarchy, and neither of these alternatives commended themselves to the educated classes of India. (Hear, hear.) In seeking to render British rule a blessing to the people they were actuated by both patriotism and common-sense. The whole movement was above board, it was constitutional and it was unselfish. (Hear, hear.) Nothing was secret. On the contrary, the great object of the Congress was to let the British public know all that it knew itself. Again, it was sometimes made a reproach to the Congress that it owed its policy to the British Committee sitting at Palace Chambers, Westminster. (Laughter.) The British Committee would be very proud—(laughter)—to wield such a power over public

opinion in India; the Imperial government might be glad if it could do so itself. (Cheers.) As a matter of fact the Committee possessed no such power, but those who made this allegation must see that their theory was incompatible with the idea of anything unconstitutional—of any conspiracy against British power in India. (Hear, hear.) Also the movement was altogether unselfish. The leaders had much to lose and nothing to gain from supporting it. And they had to thank the Government for preserving the purity of the movement, and purging away the dross, by withholding from supporters of the Congress those personal favours—(laughter)—which for the self-seeker formed so irresistible an attraction. (Cheers and laughter.) If public honours were bestowed on those most honoured by the Indian people then long before this those honours would have descended upon their chairman of that evening. (Loud cheers.) But to him the highest honour had always been to sacrifice himself for his fellow countrymen, (hear, hear), fulfilling the faithful saying, that "Whoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all." Upon the third point, the practical character of the Congress programme he would be brief. The moderation and reasonableness of the proposals spoke for themselves to anyone who would give them fair and kindly consideration. (Hear, hear.) But the Congress did not come before the Government with a cast-iron programme. Their wish was to make known to the Government the needs of the people, and to help the Government in ministering to those needs. (Hear, hear.) According to their view the welfare of India would be best secured by following the policy of Lord Lawrence (cheers), who was known as the "Saviour of India," and of the Marquis of Ripon (loud cheers), who was called the "Conqueror of India," because he had conquered the hearts of the Indian people. In this Jubilee year they did well to wish success and prosperity to the Indian National Congress, believing as they did that its labours had for their sole object the safety, honour, and welfare of her Majesty and her dominions. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. GORDON HEWART proposed the toast of "The London Indian Society."

Mr. S. ZHAUDDIN A. BALKH (Vice-President), in response, said that Indians resident in this country had always found in the Society an accessible centre, whence they had been able to express to the British public their views with regard to the needs and aspirations of their country. (Cheers.) From time to time conferences had been held by the Society to ventilate in this country matters connected with India, and at the last conference—held during the "Diamond" Jubilee celebrations—Indians of all communities resident in the United Kingdom had approached their beloved Sovereign by the presentation of a loyal address through the medium of their chairman, Mr. Dababhai Naoroji. (Cheers.) The ignorance prevailing in this country about India and the Indian people made it necessary for Indians to carry on their propaganda to educate the British people about their country and themselves. The Society was working energetically and calmly in this direction. (Cheers.) It seemed to him that the Government of India and the India Office would pay no attention to any demand until they could be sure that it was supported by the British public. (Hear, hear.)

The toast of "The Land we Live in" was proposed by MOULVI RAFFUDDIN AHMED who, in a vigorous speech, laid emphasis upon the dangers which might arise from the social ostracism to which Indians were often subjected in India. (Cheers.) The exclusion of Indians from many clubs and societies by Europeans in India was a matter of no small moment—(hear, hear)—which ought not to be forgotten in the midst of purely political discussion. It had been said that Indians had to come to England in order to find that Englishmen were gentlemen. Certainly, the treatment received by Indians in England at the hands of Englishmen was very different from the treatment received by Indians in their own country. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MARTIN WOOD, in responding to the toast, remarked that what chiefly made the world-wide reputation of England was surely its sway over the great peninsula of India—some sixteen times larger than this small island, with its forty millions as compared with India's three hundred millions. But we must be mindful of this reputation, for power was only another word for duty, and it was only as was fulfilled that such reputation could be preserved. John o' Gaunt spoke of England as "the royal nurse of kings"; but should not this

modern England of the people be equal and faithful to that true reputation? (Hear.) He trusted that, in spite of some drawbacks, it would so prove. But for this they must rely much on the Indians themselves. "Most of you have seen, and, it may be hoped, have learned the best of what England can teach. We trust you will live up to that, and do your part in this great imperial task. (Hear, hear.) And you could have no better example to this end than your revered and honourable president. (Cheers.) Consider only what he has done since your last annual gathering, in his invaluable labours in the Royal Commission. (Hear, hear.) But your society and its young members must remember that Mr. Dadabhai could not have rendered those great services to both countries if he had not from his early days studied, worked, and striven, without thought of honour or advantage for himself." (Cheers.) With such an example before them, they should also strive to do their very best for their own land, and that would also be for the benefit and glory of "this land we live in." (Cheers.)

Mr. H. MULLICK proposed the health of Prince Ranjitsinhji—the "prince of cricketers"—coupling with his name the names of Mr. Chatterjee—(cheers)—who had taken the first place in the open competition for posts in the Indian Civil Service, and of Mr. K. W. Bonnerjee—(cheers)—who had "coxed" the Balliol eight in the races last summer term. The toast was received with the greatest warmth, and

Mr. K. W. BONNERJEE, in answer to calls, briefly responded. Nothing that he had done, he said, deserved to be mentioned along with the brilliant achievements of Mr. Chatterjee and Prince Ranjitsinhji.

Mr. BALWANT SINGH (Hon. Secretary), proposing the health of the guests, mentioned the valuable services they were individually rendering to his country in various ways. Indians were not wanting in the sense of gratitude, but were always grateful for the help rendered to them in the achievement of their political aims. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. EDMUND RUSSELL responded.

Mr. HASAN SHIERFUDIN KHALIL proposed the health of the President of the London Indian Society. He said that he felt the greatest pleasure and pride in discharging the task which had been allotted to him. (Hear, hear.) His young fellow-countrymen had a sufficient inspiration in the noble example of that worthy son of India, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. (Cheers.) Mr. Naoroji had throughout his life taken an intense interest in the welfare of Indians without distinction of class or creed. (Hear, hear.) It was with a fervid zeal that he began his work more than forty years ago for the education and political wellbeing of India, and in spite of disappointments and obstacles thrown in his way—in spite of evil words showered upon him by calumnious tongues—(shame)—Mr. Naoroji had held to his task with unflinching firmness of mind. (Loud cheers.) He had laughed at the aimless ravings of responsible and irresponsible personages—(laughter)—around him, and after long years of deep thinking and earnest acting, of countless difficulties cheerfully faced and nobly overcome—(hear, hear)—years of incessant struggle with ignorance, prejudice, and officialism—he still toiled on with all the energy and vivacity of youth. (Cheers.) The active and unselfish life of Mr. Dababhai Naoroji was a well-stored armoury from which every Indian might draw his own weapons of usefulness. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI, whose rising was the signal for a scene of great enthusiasm, briefly replied. He was, he said, deeply grateful for the kind words which had been said, and he accepted them with great satisfaction as a token that the labours of his life commended themselves to his fellow-countrymen. (Cheers.) It had been to him the happiest element in his life that he sympathised with, and enjoyed the sympathy of, Indians of every class and creed without exception from the prince to the peasant. (Loud cheers.) They were, no doubt, subject to misrepresentation and misinterpretation, but they were convinced of the justice of the British people—(hear, hear)—and they must persist in the disinterested work to which they had set their hands. (Hear, hear.) The starting-point and foundation of all their hopes was the permanence of British rule in India, but it must be British rule on British principles. (Loud cheers.) That was the whole aim of the Indian National Congress, and that was the maxim which they wished to inculcate in the minds of the justice-loving people of the United Kingdom. (Loud cheers.)

OUR WEEKLY ISSUE, 1898.

The first number of the weekly INDIA will be issued on Friday, January 7, 1898.

It is proposed in the first instance to publish each week a paper of 16 large foolscap pages.

That is to say, subscribers will receive in the course of the year more than twice the number of pages which they now receive.

It is not, however, proposed to increase the Indian subscription, which will remain at 8 RUPEES per annum, prepaid, including postage.

The subscription in the United Kingdom will be 9 SHILLINGS per annum, prepaid, including postage.

The price of a single copy will be TWO PENCE or TWO ANNAS—postage extra.

A full report of Parliamentary proceedings relating to India will continue to be printed, and it is hoped that questions put and answers given on THURSDAY AFTERNOON may be fully reported in the issue of the following day.

Special attention will be given to articles upon Indian affairs which appear in British NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, and REVIEWS.

The work of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress will be regularly chronicled, and reports will be given, so far as space permits, of meetings at which Indian topics are discussed.

INDIA.

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1897.

FUTURE TRANS-FRONTIER POLICY.

In our last issue we drew pointed attention to the policy of the future on and beyond the North-West Frontier of India as foreshadowed by the *Standard*, the official spokesman of the Government. The *Standard*, (September 30) said:

The gradual but sure advance of another European Power in Asia has made it imperative to adopt a stronger and more adventurous line of action. Statesmen of all parties have agreed that India must be secured from external dangers: and this security can only be attained by the effective occupation of the military frontier which would have to be defended.

Here the action of the Government of India is made to depend upon the advance of Russia in Central Asia. On that ground the *Standard* demands, as the sole adequate means of precaution, "the effective occupation of the military frontier which would have to be defended." The security of India from external dangers—that is to say, dangers from Russian invasion or attack—is, of course, common ground. Everybody accepts that as fundamental. The real question is as to the facts of the case and the policy applicable. Now we have always held that the military frontier to be defended will be best defended on our own side of the mountains, where we are close to our base and unhampered in any way, while the Russians would be far from their base, and subject to the hostility of the mountain tribesmen between them and us. We stand by the policy associated with the great name

of Lord Lawrence. On this the *Standard* says, (October 5):

When Lord Lawrence spoke of our finding the strongest security against a Russian advance in our 'previous abstention from entanglements' on the frontier, he talked excellent practical common-sense, based on the facts of a time when Russia was thousands of miles away, and when Asiatic railways and telegraphs were still in their infancy. To quote the bare words of Lord Lawrence without reference to their context, or the circumstances that called them forth, is what in a master politician [than Mr. John Morley] might be called a lack of candour, if it did not proceed from sheer ignorance.

On the face of it, all this seems plausible enough. But when one comes to the facts of the case, one finds that the *Standard* convicts itself either of lack of candour or of sheer ignorance. In a recent issue we dealt with the impossibility of a Russian invasion of India, citing some outstanding facts sufficient to support the conclusion that Russia cannot possibly attack India by way of the North-West. The *Standard* cites no facts. It simply assumes the nearness and the menace of Russia. True, Russia has pushed forward a few troops, at fearful sacrifices, as far as the northern border of Afghanistan. But, as we pointed out, Russia is, for all the practical purposes of an invasion of India, still as many thousands of miles off as she was in Lord Lawrence's time. Her telegraphs are useless without her railways; and what is the good of her single line of railway—liable to earthquake, sand-storm, flood, Turkoman attack—for the purpose of bringing men and commissariat for a couple of thousand miles to invade India? Such an expedition is only one degree less preposterous than an expedition to the moon. Let the *Standard*, or the Government, work out the scheme of menace in practical detail, and submit it to the public. It could only cover its author with ridicule.

Let us put the case once more in the briefest terms. Colonel Hanna's exposition, which we follow, has not been answered. It cannot be answered. Which way shall the Russians come? There are five possible routes, and five only: the Bolan, the Thal-Chotiali, the Gomul, the Kuram, and the Khyber. The Chitral route is too impracticable for bare mention. We must assume 100,000 or 150,000 troops. There is no real base for such a force anywhere east of the Caspian. But Kandahar is the nearest approximation. Now, the first route—Kandahar-Jacobabad-Multan—measures 605, 666, or 678 miles, according to the three possible lines of divergence from Jacobabad. Suppose Quetta abolished: otherwise the Russians could not possibly pass. The 59 miles of the Bolan Pass will expose the invaders to excessive heat or to fierce and sudden floods filling the gorges, to a path of shingle and grit, stones and small boulders, crippling the transport animals, and in many places to wading the river up to the waist. The 160 miles of plain to the Indus is arid desert or low jungle for 115 miles, and pestilential marsh for the remaining 45 miles. Water is scanty, and often brackish; and the distance can only be travelled by small detachments at one time. From Jacobabad each of the three routes is unhealthy and destitute of supplies; and, besides the Indus, another great river, the Sutlej or the Chenab, has to be passed, to say

nothing of numberless nullahs, which must be bridged for artillery. The second route—Kandahar to Multan—known as the Thal-Chotiali route, measures 459 miles. It traverses a hot, arid wilderness, and crosses (in the 43 miles from Dera Ghazi Khan to Multan) two branches of the Indus, the Chenab, and forty-five nullahs. How are these waters to be bridged? Besides, the route is utterly impracticable in winter; and "no European troops could cross the desert, narrow as it is, by this route between May and October." The third route—Ghazi to Multan, by the Ghwalari Pass, the Gomul River, and Dera Ishmael Khan—measures 686 miles. It is very little known. But this much is known, that "it is closed at one end by heat in summer, and at the other end by cold in winter." Its physical difficulties are comparable to those of the Bolan; "it debouches into an arid desert, intersected by ravines, ramifying into numerous fan-like branches, which would oblige the invaders to advance in long unwieldy columns, with a contracted front." Then comes the Indus; and how to bridge it? But suppose the Indus crossed, there is yet fourteen days' march, through a country destitute of supplies, and intersected by fifty-nine nullahs, five of them branches of the Indus, and the Chenab as well. The fourth route—Kandahar to Rawal Pindi, by Ghazni and Kabul, the Shutargardan and Peiwar Passes, the Kuram Valley, Thal, Kohat, and Kushalgarh—measures 649 miles. "There need be little fear of an invasion by the Kuram line," writes Sir J. Watson. Why? Because, in winter, "their advance would be marked by many of the features of the French retreat from Moscow—whole companies of men and mules and camels buried in snowdrifts, or frozen to death in their sleep." In summer the invaders would be scorched by sun and wind between Kandahar and Kabul, and thinned by floods, cholera, and fever in the Kuram Valley. But let the hypothetical invaders reach Kohat and Kushalgarh. How, then, will they bridge the Indus? Let them pass the Indus. Where, then, can they rest and reorganise, before attacking the fortress of Rawal Pindi? And if they fail to take it, what then? How can they even exist? Sir Edward Hamley gives up the Kuram route for a different reason. "A column so strong and well-equipped as to be independent could not pass here; one that could not act independently would scarcely venture." The fifth route—Kandahar to Peshawar, by Ghazni and Kabul, the Lataband, the Jugdalak, and Khyber Passes—measures 490 miles. This route debouches, not into a desert or a rough district, but into the fertile valley of Peshawar, and, except the Thal-Chotiali route, it is the shortest. But the same difficulties beset it with the Kuram, and the passes are more difficult and fatiguing than the Bolan. True, we might easily defend such a position as Lundi Kotal. But where is the use, when "a fortified camp at the eastern mouth of the Khyber, almost within sight of our base, Peshawar, would seal it so effectually, that Sir Edward Hamley was not exaggerating when he said that he did not see how a single Russian regiment could ever issue from it?"

Now these are the routes, and the Russians are welcome to their choice. Except in the last case, we have not intimated any British opposition at all. Consider what an invasion by a modern army means, and let the Russians trudge these hundreds of miles from their quasi-base at Kandahar—or elsewhere—without any opposition from our troops. They would not be much to look at when they reached the Indus. But one must assume that they will meet with opposition, and harassing if not absolutely destructive opposition, from the tribesmen on the way—that is, if we do not persist in alienating the tribesmen. Finally, they have to meet British troops at whatever point on the route we may choose to challenge their progress. The advantages of being near our base and of allowing the Russians to wear themselves out in a struggle with physical difficulties and with the tribesmen are not a whit less strong now than they were in the days of Lord Lawrence. Every yard we advance to meet them, now as then, is an advantage to them, and a disadvantage to us. The argument of Lord Lawrence is, therefore, as valid to-day as ever it was, and we challenge the *Standard* and the Government to support by argument their ridiculous assertion that a forward movement is necessary or in any way advantageous. On the grounds of mere physical difficulty alone—to say nothing of the mere impossibility of bringing up commissariat for 100,000 or 150,000 men—a Russian invasion is ludicrously impracticable, and to assert it without proofs is mere impudence. On November 10, Lord George Hamilton, speaking at Acton, briefly indicated "the main objects we should try to attain." His ideas may appear to the unsophisticated observer to fall short of the aspirations of the *Standard*. Lord George said:

In the first place, let us concentrate our strength and attention on those routes and positions only which are essential to the fulfilment of our obligations, and thus avoid dispersion of forces and annexation of territory. Elsewhere let us take the general submission rendered to us by the tribes as an acknowledgement of our supremacy and interfere otherwise as little as possible. Every means must be taken to check and curtail the traffic in arms, and, on the other hand, every legitimate opportunity utilized for opening up roads and communications. We could then trust to what I would term the automatic forces of civilization which are in our wake—trade, commerce, increase of comforts and wealth, security of life and property—to gradually work their way and win these tribes from the murderous and predatory instincts of the past.

Mighty benevolent, to be sure. As if the murderous and predatory instincts of the tribes had anything to do with the matter at all, if we would only let them alone. But one wishes one could believe that the military party in Calcutta will allow us to "interfere as little as possible" with the tribesmen. On the face of it, no doubt, it looks like a sign of a remnant of grace that "annexation of territory" is to be avoided. But if so, what is the meaning of concentrating our strength and attention on "those routes and positions" that are "essential to the fulfilment of our obligations"? Our obligations to protect India? And the Amir? Lord George Hamilton on his own frank admission prepares us for British occupation of forts in the conquered districts and the opening up and maintenance of more roads like the one to Chitral. That

is the "forward" school all over. As likely as not we shall be asked to establish a strong post in the Tirah, where our soldiers might find a bracing relief from the relaxing climate of Peshawar and Rawal Pindi, and our benevolent road-making would smooth the way for the Russian invasion we are labouring so hard to invite. At the same time, these posts would be a constant irritation to the tribesmen whom we wish to conciliate, and a fearful drain on the Indian exchequer, which is already all but dry. And this, if you please, is a settlement to take credit for! This is Imperial statesmanship. *Quos Deus vult perdere prius dementat*. The future is on the knees of the gods, and one could only look forward with the resignation of dismay if one did not perceive a remarkable awakening of public opinion in this country against the "forward" policy. That awakening should be complete when it is realised—as we venture to think it soon will be—that it was mere prudence which prevented Lord G. Hamilton from employing the term "annexation," and that much the same thing, from the military point of view, is to be attempted under another name.

MR. TILAK'S APPLICATION TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

THE Lord Chancellor, with the fastidious delicacy which has marked his public career, was careful to be present on November 19 at the hearing of Mr. Tilak's application before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In the October issue of INDIA we endeavoured to remove two misconceptions which were at that time prevalent in the newspapers—namely, (1) that it was competent for the High Court of Bombay finally to determine whether an application might or might not be made to the Privy Council; and (2) that the jury in Mr. Tilak's case necessarily consisted of equal numbers of Englishmen and Indians. "If," we wrote, "such an application should be made, the Privy Council would 'probably hear it.' The anticipation has proved to be accurate, while as regards Mr. Tilak's jury it is now known to have consisted of six Englishmen and three Indians. There were two respects in which the English and the Indian sections of the jury differed. The English members did not understand the Marathi language in which the incriminated articles were written. The Indian members were familiar with it. The English members declared Mr. Tilak to be guilty. The Indian members declared him to be not guilty. The verdict of the majority prevailed, and Mr. Tilak was sentenced to eighteen months' "rigorous" imprisonment. A verdict of this kind would have called for close scrutiny under any circumstances. But under the extraordinary circumstances of the time, and especially after the remarkable summing-up of Mr. Justice Strachey, it was naturally received in this country with great uneasiness and suspicion. Mr. Justice Strachey's interpretation of the law provoked remonstrances from all sections of the British press, without distinction of party, and even friendly critics approved it not as a judicial pronouncement

but as a piece of political expediency. Communications like these render the decision of the Judicial Committee at first sight specially important. But it is well to remember (1) that the decision was not accompanied by any statement of reasons; and (2) that we do not know how many members of the Judicial Committee agreed with every word of the decision as announced by Lord Halsbury. The Lord Chancellor, who was lately reproved by Mr. Asquith for a startling exercise of political patronage, may be the most impartial and magnanimous person in the world. But, as many of the newspapers promptly pointed out, it was to say the least of it unfortunate that a member of the Cabinet which was responsible for the Poona prosecutions should have been the spokesman of the Privy Council's refusal to grant leave to appeal. The Court consisted of the Lord Chancellor, Lord Hobhouse, Lord Davey and Sir Richard Couch. The decision to refuse the application may conceivably have been the decision of only two members of the Court, backed by the casting vote of the Lord Chancellor. Be this as it may, we should be greatly surprised if it were the case that either Lord Hobhouse or Lord Davey endorsed Lord Halsbury's entirely gratuitous and really amazing tribute to Mr. Justice Strachey's summing-up.

Mr. Asquith's brilliant and incisive speech, which we report fully in our Special Supplement, seems to the mere layman to reduce Mr. Justice Strachey's summing-up to sheer absurdity. Let us look at Mr. Asquith's leading points in the light of the Lord Chancellor's formula, which was as follows:—

Their Lordships are of opinion, taking the view of the whole of the summing-up, which is of very great length, that there is nothing in that which, in their Lordships' opinion, calls upon them to indicate any dissent from or necessity to correct what is therein contained, looking at the summing-up as a whole, and looking at each part of what was said by the light of what else was said.

The Lord Chancellor's English is curious. But his meaning is unmistakeable. He is of opinion that Mr. Justice Strachey's interpretation of the law was in its essential features sound and good. Now, what were its essential features—in other words, were there any obvious errors in those parts of it which are not, and cannot be, modified "by the 'light of what else was said'?" We confess that, in spite of Lord Halsbury, we are perverse enough to think that there were, and that Mr. Asquith's speech abundantly proved that there were. Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code, under which Mr. Tilak was brought to trial, imposes a penalty upon a man who "excites or attempts to excite feelings of disaffection to the Government established by 'law in British India.'" There is, however, an "Explanation" added to the Section, which runs as follows:—

Such a disapprobation of the measures of the Government as is compatible with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government, and to support the lawful authority of the Government against unlawful attempts to subvert or resist that authority, is not disaffection. Therefore the making of comments on the measures of the Government with the intention of exciting only this species of disapprobation is not an offence within this clause.

Clearly the crucial point here is the distinction

drawn between disapprobation which is legitimate and disaffection which is criminal. We pass over Mr. Justice Strachey's astounding definition of disaffection as "the absence of affection"—though it is to be noted that, while he purported to be quoting from Sir Comer Petheram, what Sir Comer spoke of was "the contrary of affection," a very different thing. We do not press this point because it may perhaps be regarded as of minor importance "by the light of what else was said." But can that excuse be made to extend to the judge's demarcation of what is legitimate criticism and of what is disaffection? Here, at any rate, we see no possibility of an answer to Mr. Asquith's searching and luminous argument. The argument, which may be described as common sense put incisively, is simply this: that the criterion of legitimate criticism is, in the words of the "Explanation," compatibility with "a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government." Those, as every intelligent reader must, one would think, instantly perceive, are the essential words of the "Explanation." It is not Mr. Asquith alone who so regards them. Sir James Stephen himself, who was responsible for this portion of the law, explained its meaning in these simple words: "You may say what you like about any Government measure, you may publish or speak what you please, so long as you say or write what is consistent with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government."

It is not too much to say that the cardinal feature of Mr. Justice Strachey's summing-up was a flat disregard of these essential words of the "Explanation." According to his view of the law, all else in the "Explanation" is superfluous and otiose except the word "measures." The criterion of legitimate criticism, on his theory, is not the intention of the critic and the consequences of his criticism—it is not "compatibility with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government"—it is simply and solely that the criticism is directed against "the measures of the Government" and not against "the Government itself." It is this thread that colours the whole fabric of the summing-up. Nor is it in the smallest degree modified "by the light of what else was said." Mr. Justice Strachey says in effect: "You may criticise as bitterly, as ferociously, and as unfairly as you please any specific administrative or legislative measure of the Government; but the moment you pass from criticism of this kind to any adverse criticism of the Government itself, you pass from the region of the legitimate into the region of the criminal, no matter what the purpose or the effects of your criticism may be." Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, in the article which he contributed to our issue of November, drew attention to the metaphysical subtlety of this distinction between "the measures of the Government" and "the Government itself" and asked what the latter phrase included:—

Do the words only mean the Governor and his Executive Council, or do they mean all persons entrusted with legislative, executive, and judicial functions? If the words 'the Government itself' are to be taken as meaning all these persons, then,

according to Mr. Justice Strachey, ridiculing a policeman on his beat and so holding him up to the contempt of the bystanders would apparently be sedition.

What possible answer is there to this *reductio ad absurdum*? Besides, Mr. Justice Strachey's interpretation of the law cuts both ways. That is to say, it appears equally paradoxical whether one considers its stringency regarding criticism of "the Government itself" or its laxity regarding criticism of "the measures of the Government." Surely criticism of Government is criticism of Government measures, and criticism of Government measures is criticism of Government. "By their fruits ye shall know them." How, for example, can one apply the epithets extravagant, wrong-headed and suicidal to the "forward" frontier policy without applying them *pro tanto* to the Government which is responsible for that policy? One cannot help thinking that by far the more serviceable as well as more rational criterion of legitimate disapprobation, as distinguished from criminal disaffection, is not that the subject matter of it admits of being labelled with a particular description, but that the intentions which animate it and the disposition which it is calculated to excite are of a particular kind—compatible, that is to say, with obedience to lawful authority. But Mr. Justice Strachey's summing-up appears to have been vitiated by a totally wrong conception—not made any the less wrong "by the light of what else was said"—of the function which the "Explanation" was intended to discharge. He treated the "Explanation" as an "exception"—in other words, as an exhaustive enumeration of cases not to be included within the scope of the section. He placed the emphasis, and the whole emphasis, upon the word "measures," interpreting that word in a special and narrow sense. Apart from the objection which we have already urged against this view, there are two further objections which, although subsidiary, are worth noting. In the first place, Mr. Justice Strachey's interpretation reduces all the second part of the "Explanation" (that is, from the word "therefore" onwards) to a ridiculous superfluity. In the second place, "Explanations" abound in the Indian Penal Code, and it does not require a profound knowledge of the Code to perceive that, if every "Explanation" were to be interpreted as Mr. Justice Strachey has interpreted this one, the result would be absurd confusion. No impartial observer, we think, can suppose that Mr. Justice Strachey's interpretation of the law will stand. But, if this were not so, and if Lord Halsbury's *obiter dictum* were to be treated seriously, it would obviously become necessary to amend the Penal Code, and to re-state in still less unambiguous words the real meaning of those who framed the "Explanation" to Section 124A.

SIR H. FOWLER BREAKS SILENCE.

WE called attention last month to the curious silence of Sir H. H. Fowler, M.P., at a time when some of his colleagues in the late Liberal Cabinet, and many independent members of the Liberal party, were denouncing the present costly and sanguinary war beyond the North-West Frontier, and explaining the grave responsibility of

Lord Salisbury's Government in the matter. Sir Henry Fowler, we are glad to say, has at last broken his remarkable silence. The long and, in many respects, admirable speech which he delivered to his constituents on Saturday, November 20, is fully reported in another part of our present issue. Before we pass on to consider the more important topics with which Sir Henry Fowler dealt, it may be well to refer briefly to a rather striking sentence which occurred towards the close of his address. He is reported to have said :—

I have always done my utmost to keep Indian affairs outside the range of party controversy. I have felt it to be my duty, though at the cost of the most unscrupulous misrepresentation, to support in legislation and administration the Indian policy of the Government when I have considered it on the whole to be right.

Misrepresentation must indeed be unscrupulous when it censures a statesman for supporting a policy which he considers to be right. But Sir H. Fowler appears to overlook the fact that he has frequently been criticised—in these columns and elsewhere—for failing to attack a policy which he undoubtedly considered to be wrong. We refer especially to his strange lack of vigour throughout the past two-and-a-half years in dealing with the two important departments of policy in which the decision of his colleagues and himself was flatly and hastily reversed by their successors—we mean in the matter of Chitral, and (though this was a less glaring case) in the matter of the Cotton Duties. Lord Salisbury's Government, having determined upon a reversal of the policy of their predecessors with regard to Chitral, met Parliament, after the General Election, on August 15, 1895. But Sir Henry Fowler not only did not take the opportunity of moving an amendment to the Address, but actually did not make any speech at all on the subject of Chitral. More than that, he walked out of the House of Commons when Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment, calling for the evacuation of Chitral, was about to be reached. The result was that Mr. Balfour was able to appeal to Sir W. Wedderburn to postpone his amendment, and succeeded ultimately in closing it before it was discussed, on the ground that "the late Secretary for India" has left the House." The next opportunity for debate arose on September 3, 1895, on the motion for going into Committee on the Indian Budget. On that occasion Sir H. Fowler did, indeed, make a speech. But he did not move an amendment, nor take a division; and a critic so friendly and conspicuously fair as the *Manchester Guardian* wrote: "we do not profess to understand so spiritless a proceeding." The worst of the spiritless proceeding—or as we termed it, "blank cartridge"—was that it prevented the Liberal members below the gangway, who had an amendment on the paper, from taking a division. The next opportunity for discussion occurred at the meeting of Parliament in 1896. In the meantime Lord George Hamilton and his colleagues had carried out their revolutionary policy in Chitral. But again Sir H. Fowler made no sign, and although Sir W. Wedderburn moved an amendment condemning the occupation of Chitral, and regretting above all the violation of the Viceroy's proclamation to the tribesmen, Sir H. Fowler would not take any part in the debate. Yet it was this debate that extracted from Lord George Hamilton the ridiculous speech on the blessings of the "forward" movement which has since proved invaluable to the critics of the "forward" policy.

Sir H. Fowler's behaviour with regard to the reversal of his policy upon the Indian Cotton Duties has been much the same. In Parliament and in the country, on both of these important questions, he has shown all along the most amazing reluctance to criticise the policy of his successor. It was hardly, therefore, to be wondered at that Lord George Hamilton, in his *apologia* of

November 10 last, after referring to the vigorous and well-timed denunciation of his Chitral policy by Mr. John Morley and Mr. Asquith, used these suggestive words:

I am glad to know that Sir H. Fowler is for the future to have charge of this question. He is a gentleman to whom I am much indebted for the support I received, not only in the House of Commons but also elsewhere, on all serious questions affecting India, and I am confident that he will say nothing which will either reflect on the character of the Viceroy or add one iota to his troubles.

This was, it seems to us, a singularly maladroit attempt on Lord G. Hamilton's part to draw a red herring between Mr. Morley and Mr. Asquith on one side and Sir H. Fowler on the other. On the following day the *Daily News* and the *Daily Chronicle* published an amusing paragraph denying, "on the best authority," that there was any truth in the suggestion that Sir H. Fowler differed from his colleagues on the Front Opposition Bench on the Chitral question. Sir H. Fowler's speech of November 20, although it was greeted with some appearance of jubilation by the *Times* and the *Standard*, seems on the whole to substantiate this announcement. So far, at any rate, as the future is concerned, Sir H. Fowler plainly agrees with Mr. Morley and Mr. Asquith that the policy of the entire Liberal party with reference to the North-West Frontier is, and must be, the policy of Lord Lawrence. There is one passage in the admirable concluding portion of Sir H. Fowler's speech for which we are peculiarly grateful. He said:

On political, on financial, on administrative grounds, as well as upon the strategical grounds on which I am not competent to speak, but with respect to which I know the opinions of some of the greatest soldiers in Her Majesty's forces, we oppose the policy, *however disguised*, which means the occupation and the annexation of the vast tract of country now held by the tribes on the north-west.

That is the point—"we oppose the policy *however disguised*." Lord G. Hamilton said in his speech of November 10, "let us concentrate our strength and "attention on those routes and positions only which are "essential to the fulfilment of our obligations, and thus "avoid dispersion of force and annexation of territory." Lord G. Hamilton deprecated "annexation," and the *Daily News* and the *Westminster Gazette* fell into the trap. Sir H. Fowler knows better. He knows that the "forward" school is far too prudent and old-fashioned to advocate "annexation." He knows that the "forward" school seeks to attain its ends under more specious names which throw dust in the eyes of the discerning British elector. He therefore bids us, and bids us rightly, oppose the "forward" policy "however disguised."

On the second and subsidiary topic of the "breach of faith" involved in the retention of Chitral Sir H. Fowler's speech was, as it was bound to be, less satisfactory. But here let us, at once, get rid of some of the cobwebs which have gathered about this topic in discussions in party newspapers. The issue is, obviously, a plain and simple issue of fact. When the Government of India in March, 1895, was about to despatch an expedition for the relief of Dr. Robertson and his force in Chitral, it issued, not merely to the peoples of Swat and Bajaur, but also to the tribesmen of the border generally, a proclamation guaranteeing that there should be no permanent occupation of territory, and no interference with the independence of the tribes. When the work of relief had been performed, Lord Salisbury's Cabinet, hastily reversing the policy of their predecessors, ordered the occupation of Chitral, the construction of a military road from Peshawar to Chitral, and the fortification of military posts at Chakdara and the Malakand. In ordering this policy, Lord Salisbury's Cabinet violated the proclamation of March 14, 1895. They perpetrated, in

Mr. Asquith's just and accurate words, "a gross breach of faith." That is a matter of fact and of history which no arguments or theories about the policy which any other persons did or did not contemplate or discuss can ever in the slightest degree modify. But now observe the argument adopted by Lord G. Hamilton and by the leader-writers of the *Times* and the *Standard*. These gentlemen set out to prove that Sir H. Fowler, as Secretary of State for India, spent a considerable time in debating with himself and others whether he should sanction a policy involving a like breach of faith. They therefore proceed to the really grotesque conclusion that Lord G. Hamilton and his colleagues cannot possibly have been guilty of a breach of faith, because, if you please, Sir H. Fowler and his colleagues contemplated, in their judgement, a similar breach of faith. It is as if a prisoner caught red-handed should seek to excuse himself on the ground that some other person had contemplated, but on mature consideration had refrained from, the same crime. Now, for those who, like ourselves, owe, so far as India is concerned, no allegiance to any political party—who are not bound *jurare in verba magistrum*—this mode of reasoning is obviously devoid of the slightest shred of value. The whole force of it, so far as it has any force at all, is to suggest that Sir H. Fowler, being 'tarred'—or, at any rate, having taken an unconscionably long time before making up his mind not to be tarred—with the same brush as Lord G. Hamilton, cannot decently accuse Lord G. Hamilton of breach of faith. But even if this point were good against Sir H. Fowler, it would not be good against even his colleagues in the late Liberal Government; and it is merely absurd as against unofficial Liberals, and the great mass of impartial observers here and in India. After all, these personal recriminations are only of infinitesimal importance. Nothing—certainly not a thoroughly contemptible and cowardly endeavour to shift the responsibility to the subordinate Government of Lord Elgin—can obliterate the act of perfidy for which Lord Salisbury's Cabinet has made itself responsible. As for Sir H. Fowler, we think that, upon the whole, he clears himself tolerably well. He took, no doubt, as we pointed out over and over again in May, June and July, 1895, an unnecessarily and suspiciously long time to decide that he would insist upon the observance of the Viceroy's proclamation. Nor does he improve matters from his own personal point of view when he tells us, as he does now, that "the question was primarily a military one." But when all is said and done, the fundamental fact remains that in the long run he resolved upon a policy consistent with the proclamation, while Lord G. Hamilton lightly and hastily gave his mandate for a policy flatly at variance with the proclamation. Sir H. Fowler's excuse for his dilatoriness is, it seems to us, worthy of consideration. He says in effect that he was assured by the Government of India that the tribes were perfectly willing to make a friendly bargain by which they would forego part of the rights guaranteed by the proclamation. Before dismissing the suggestion he consented that the prospects of such a bargain should be enquired into. But he never doubted that a really peaceable bargain of that kind could not be made, and subsequent events have proved terribly enough that he was right. They have, by the same token, proved that his successor was inexcusably wrong.

CRUELTY TO LORD G. HAMILTON.—The *Standard* wrote in a leading article on September 25; "there are few reverses among those which have interrupted our record of success in India that might not be traced to the error of placing men in positions for which they are not conspicuously fitted."

THE PUBLIC DEBT OF INDIA.

In the year of the Queen's accession the debt of India was a small matter. In 1840 the total Debt and Obligations of the Government of India amounted only to Rx. 32,750,000 raised in India and £1,734,000 raised in England. On March 31, 1896, these burdens had grown to Rx 118,500,000 and £114,000,000 respectively. During the sixty years Rx. 86,000,000 and £112,000,000 of debt have accumulated. In those same sixty years the National Debt of the United Kingdom has diminished from £850,000,000 to £650,000,000. In other words, £200,000,000 of debt have been dissipated. The contrast is striking, but misleading. Let us examine the matter somewhat closely and see how far the implication, which the comparison between the two countries conveys, is justified by the facts, stripped of ambiguous circumstances.

In the first place, the year 1840 is a bad point of departure, as the fundamental change of Government, from the East India Company to the Crown, in 1857 makes it impossible to institute legitimate comparisons in financial matters between years divided by that change. Nor would 1857 or 1858 be a desirable point of departure. India was then in the throes of the great Mutiny, which, happening under John Company's rule, had to be paid for in the first years of the new government. In the three years 1857-8—1859-60, there were deficits of Rx. 7,360,000, Rx. 13,580,000, and Rx. 10,770,000, making Rx. 32,210,000 in the aggregate; and the total debt, if one reckons the rupee at par, increased from Rx. 59,500,000 to Rx. 98,100,000. There was a further rapid increase in the next two years—when the total debt reached Rx. 107,500,000—followed by as rapid a decline to Rx. 98,500,000 in 1864. The year 1860, therefore, seems to be a reasonable point from which to set out in an investigation of the growth of Indian indebtedness under British rule.

In the next place, one must bear in mind that the National Debt of the United Kingdom and the Public Debt of India are not alike in all things, and, therefore, not comparable without qualification and analysis. The former is almost entirely a war debt pure and simple, representing unproductive expenditure of public money in the past. The latter is largely made up of capital expenditure on public works of a more or less reproductive nature, chiefly railways and irrigation works. The matter is further complicated. A large portion of the Indian railway debt has been raised in sterling, the interest on which, owing to the heavy fall in the exchange value of the rupee, has become a crushing burden on the railway undertakings of Government. Thus these "reproductive" public works do not, as a matter of fact, pay their way. Now the burden of a National Debt is the annual interest charge. If capital invested in public works cannot or does not earn the necessary interest the practical result to the taxpayer is not easily distinguishable from that which supervenes on an increase of unproductive debt—taxes must be imposed to pay the annual charge. Keeping these considerations in mind, one

may now analyse the growth of the Indian Public Debt from the year ended April 30, 1860, to the year ended March 31, 1896.

The following table shows how the debt has grown in the last thirty-six years:—

PUBLIC DEBT OF INDIA.

Year.	In India.			In England.
	Funded.	Unfunded.	Total.	
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	£
1860	—	—	71,969,460	26,138,000
1866	63,564,999	7,872,252	71,437,251	26,946,400
1876	72,772,981	7,318,023	80,091,004	49,797,033
1886	92,703,982	8,013,498	100,717,480	73,806,621
1896	103,788,928	14,646,388	118,435,296	113,903,732

In the above table the important points are these. The increase of the unfunded debt is more than accounted for by the growth of Savings Bank Deposits from nothing in 1860 and 1866 to Rx. 11,296,909 in 1896. Practically the debt was stationary from 1860 to 1866, so that the whole increase since 1860 has taken place in the last thirty years. In the last thirty years, that is, since 1866, no less than forty crores of rupees—Rx. 40,000,000—have been added to the funded debt in India, and £87,000,000 to the sterling debt in England. These are gigantic sums borrowed in a very short period of time. Let us see what India has to show for these loans.

Prior to 1867-8 the Government of India's capital expenditure on railways and irrigation works had all been met out of revenue—[see Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1895-6, at p. 195]—consequently the public debt of India in 1866 may be taken to be a debt unproductive in character, and of the kind which it is desirable to diminish rather than increase. Since 1866 the following sums have been spent on the construction of railways or irrigation works, or in the purchase, etc., of railways—from borrowed money, i.e., from money "not charged against revenue"—namely, Rx. 96,746,735 and £33,553,451. The account, then, stands thus:—

New debt created since 1866 ..	Rx. 40,000,000	£87,000,000
Invested in reproductive public works since 1866 ..	96,750,000	33,500,000
Reproductive capital expenditure greater (+) or less (—) than increase of debt ..	+ Rx. 56,750,000	—£53,500,000

The position, then, is this. In thirty years the Government of India have raised £53,500,000 of sterling debt for general purposes over and above some £33,500,000 incurred specifically in purchase or in redemption of liabilities, i.e., purchase, etc., of railways. Out of this £53,500,000, producing at the different rates of exchange prevailing at the times the different portions of this total sum were raised far more than Rx. 53,500,000—out of this £53,500,000, Rx. 56,750,000 has been applied to the construction of reproductive public works. What has become of the balance? We will illustrate our meaning.

During the 11 years 1884-5—1894-5, the sterling debt of India was increased by some £46,000,000, made up of yearly borrowings varying in amount

from nothing to nearly £11,900,000. Of this total only about £22,000,000 was incurred specifically for the purchase, etc., of railways. The remaining £24,000,000 was, to all intents and purposes, first remitted to India and then spent on public works there in rupees. Clearly in recent years £1,000,000 remitted to India would produce more than Rx. 1,000,000. Thus, in 1894-5 £5,892,034 of sterling debt was raised. This at the average rate of exchange for the year (1 rupee=13-0d.) was the equivalent of Rx. 10,802,812. A simple calculation for each year 1884-5—1894-5 will show that in the aggregate this £24,000,000, borrowed in England, practically produced Rx. 36,000,000 in India. Obviously, if £1=Rs. 16, £1,000,000 sterling raised in England, whether applied to the ordinary purposes of Government or to redeeming debt (whether gold or silver), and whether remitted to India or used in reduction of the Secretary of State's drawings in bills on India, must either produce Rx. 1,600,000 in India on exchange, or—which comes to the same thing—set free that amount in the hands of the Government of India for other purposes. Roughly speaking, then, and taking into account the fluctuations in the rate of exchange, the £53,500,000 added to the general gold debt since 1866 may be taken to have produced at least twenty crores over and above its par equivalent in rupees—in other words, a total sum of Rx. 73,500,000.

What then has happened is this. The Government of India has to account for an addition to the debt in thirty years of Rx. 40,000,000 and £87,000,000. If these two sums of different denominations are unjustifiably added together—a practice in favour at the India Office, (see p. 195 of the Finance Accounts quoted above)—and called Rx. 127,000,000, and a set-off claimed for Rx. 130,250,000 expended on public works, it looks as if more money had been invested in reproductive public works than had been added to the debt—as if, in fact, the unproductive debt had been reduced by an aliquot transfer to the reproductive category of this apparent difference of Rx. 3,250,000 in favour of the Government of India. This, and far more than this, is indeed the claim put forward by the Government of India. But analysed as we have analysed it the matter works out as follows:—

APPLICATION OF DEBT CREATED 1866-96.

Sterling Debt created for and applied to specific reproductive outlay ..	£33,500,000
Balance of sterling debt raised, namely, £53,500,000, and applied to Rupee expenditure, equals, say ..	Rx. 73,500,000
Add new Rupee debt created since 1866 ..	Rx. 40,000,000

Total new debt to account for ..	Rx. 113,500,000
Invested in reproductive public works over and above specific sterling capital outlay shown above ..	Rx. 96,750,000
Increase of Debt uncovered by reproductive capital outlay ..	Rx. 16,750,000

Nor is this all. To this must be added the increase of Rx. 7,000,000 in the unfunded debt, which is as much debt as the funded portion. In this way, one arrives at a total increase of public debt of Rx. 28,750,000, over and above such increase as has been invested in reproductive public works. Where has that money gone? We put the question in this form because owing to a series of operations with the sterling and rupee debt on the one hand, and reproductive and unproductive debt on the other, the Government of India claim to show a reduction in the unproductive debt, as thus:—

CLASSIFICATION OF PERMANENT DEBT IN INDIA
AND IN ENGLAND.

	<i>Public works.</i>	<i>Other purposes.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
	Rx. and £.	Rx. and £.	Rx. and £.
1866....	—	63,564,999	63,564,999
1896....	154,227,544	63,465,116	217,692,660

Now this extraordinary result has been brought about in the main by treating Rx. 1,000,000 spent in India on public works as a set-off to £1,000,000 of debt raised in England. Seeing that each million pounds has during the last ten years produced anything from Rx. 1,300,000 to Rx. 1,800,000, the question arises, what has been done with the product of exchange?

There is yet another point. Since 1866 over eighteen crores—Rx. 18,000,000—have been invested in railways or irrigation works out of revenue. In some mysterious way this capital is charged with the current rate of interest on the Government debt, and debited to the railway undertakings, but credited to the general debt account, with the result that this latter is made to wear an unduly favourable aspect. Altogether, look at it how we may there is something which wants a good deal of explanation in connexion with the rapid increase during the last 30 years of the Indian Public debt. Here is a final summary of the figures.

THE INDIAN DEBT AND PUBLIC WORKS
EXPENDITURE, 1866—1896.

<i>Money received.</i>	<i>Money invested.</i>
<i>Loans specifically appropriated</i>	<i>Expenditure</i>
£ 33,500,000	£ 33,500,000
Balance of sterling loans, i.e., £53,500,000 = 73,500,000 Rx.	Public works .. 96,750,000 Rx.
Rupee loans .. 40,000,000	Do. from revenue .. 18,000,000
Increase unfunded debt .. 7,000,000	Balance to be accounted for .. 23,750,000
From revenue .. 18,000,000	
Rx. 138,500,000	Rx. 138,500,000

Towards this sum of nearly twenty-four crores (Rx. 24,000,000) the net deficit of the thirty years only contributes a crore and a half, Rx. 1,530,000. How then has all this money, the product of a low exchange, been absorbed? In the limits of a single article it is not possible to do justice to so difficult and intricate a subject as the Indian debt, but we have said enough to show that the subject is well worth study. We hope to return to the subject "in another place" in the near future.

"ENGLAND AND INDIA."

MR. ROMESH CHUNDER DUTT'S SUGGESTIONS
FOR THE FUTURE.

"The object which we placed before ourselves in undertaking this little work was to show that the administration of India is determined by the current of opinions in England, that progress in India is stimulated by English progress, and that the history of India under British rule is shaped by those great influences which make for reforms in Europe." So writes Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt in the concluding chapter of his little volume "England and India," which has lately been published in London by Messrs. Chatto and Windus. Mr. Dutt undoubtedly proves his point, and very many readers in England and in India will, we hope, make themselves familiar with his vigorous survey of progress in India during the past hundred years. To our thinking, however, the most interesting part of his book is his series of suggestions for the future. These are given in his concluding chapter, which might well be reprinted in pamphlet form and circulated widely both in England and in India.

"A GREAT CONSOLATION."

Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, we may remind our English readers, is no fanatical partisan, nor ignorant amateur. He is one of those formidable people who are called "experts." An Indian member of the Indian Civil Service, he attained the high posts of Officiating Commissioner in Orissa, and Superintendent of Orissa Tributary States in India. He was for some time a member of the Legislative Council of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and his books upon "Civilisation in Ancient India" and kindred subjects have made his name well known to serious students of Indian affairs. What such a man has to say with reference to the future of British administration in India deserves a respectful and attentive hearing. "India," he says, "has advanced with England, has occasionally blundered with England, but has in the long run moved onwards, however slowly, in the path of progress chalked out by England."

To the people of India (Mr. Dutt continues) this is a great consolation. We feel assured by the knowledge that we have thrown in our lot with a nation, not only one of the greatest on earth, but also one of the most progressive. We feel assured by the belief that, under the wise dispensation of Providence, the progress of England is our progress, England's gain our gain. And we feel assured by the idea, which is as true as it is encouraging, that every generation of English statesmen necessarily exert their influence on Indian administration, that their endeavours stimulate our progress, their successes lead to our reforms.

INFLUENTIAL POLITICAL BODIES.

Mr. Dutt takes his stand neither with the forlorn and faint-hearted pessimists nor with the extreme and unreasoning optimists. He prefers the safe middle ground of rational optimism. The unreasoning optimists desire no further progress. They are annoyed by any criticism, however moderate. In their view, a thoughtful Indian is disloyal and political bodies are necessarily seditious. Mr. Dutt

thinks that 'unreasoning optimism makes a mistake here.

Rightly viewed, the influential political bodies in India are the strongest supports of the British rule. These bodies consist of the leaders of the Indian communities, educated, intelligent, loyal by their own interests, interpreters between the rulers and the people, men who have everything to gain by the continuance of the British rule, men who have staked everything on that rule, men who have everything to lose by the severance of India from England. Their view of things is not always the official view; and it is a gain, therefore, when the official view is so constantly and prominently placed before the public, that the non-official view should also find some expression. Their criticism is not always pleasant to officials; but public criticism is always beneficial to the cause of good government, and it is a notable fact that the administration is purest in those parts of India where public criticism is the strongest. They do not speak with the knowledge of details which officials can justly lay claim to; but their general views and opinions are not necessarily wrong, and it is a gain to know what the views of the leaders of the people are. It would be a wise policy, therefore, to treat the influential political bodies in India with courtesy and respect even when their suggestions cannot be accepted; it would be an unwise policy to repress or discredit them in the eyes of the nation. To discredit or repress them would be to allow opportunities to wilder spirits, who are kept down by the influence of the educated classes. It would be exchanging criticism which we hear, and methods of work which we see, for less educated and less legitimate criticism which we shall not hear, and darker methods of work which we shall not see. The worst enemies of England could not devise a policy more disastrous to her interests; and sections of English politicians and of the English press, which are seeking to discredit and repress the movements of the educated, loyal, and intelligent communities of India, are playing into the hands of England's enemies, and are creating difficulties for the British rule in India.

"THE POVERTY OF INDIA."

Mr. Dutt says that the gravest difficulty which English administrators in India have to face lies in the extreme poverty of the mass of the people. Four-fifths of the population depend upon agriculture, and except in Bengal, which is blessed with the permanent settlement, most of them are in the hands of money-lenders. No doubt official figures point to an increase of what is called "the trade of India." But this (as, by the way, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has never ceased to contend) is really English trade with India and in India:

Among the many blessings which England has conferred on India, the encouragement of Indian industries is not one. The increase in the value of imports into India really means that the manual industries of India have died out in an unequal competition with the steam and machinery of England. And the increase in the value of exports from India means that vast quantities of food and raw material have to be sent out from India to pay for imported English goods. In the early days of the Company's rule, fabrics produced by Indian weavers supplied the markets of Europe, and men still living can remember the days when every village in the weaving districts had its looms, and millions of Indian weavers were supported by that profitable industry. How this industry was gradually strangled and destroyed, first by protective duties imposed on Indian goods in England, and then by an unequal competition; how Indian weavers who were content with threepence or fourpence a day found themselves ruined by the cheaper products of English looms; and how the weaver communities of India were compelled to abandon their trade, and to depend on agriculture or petty trade, or on humble and ill-paid appointments in public or private offices—all this forms one of the saddest chapters in the history of British India. What happened to the weavers has also happened to the other industrial classes.

Similarly, railways and carrying steamers in India have been constructed with English capital, and the

interest and profit come to England, and if new products like tea are now grown in India they are grown mostly by English companies. "Trade and public works, carried on or constructed in a country with its own capital, are evidence of the material prosperity of the people. In the case of India they are profitable investments of English capital, and while they undoubtedly benefit India in a variety of ways, they have not secured the object of materially improving the condition of the agricultural and artisan classes in India."

THE FIRST REMEDY—PERMANENT SETTLEMENT.

The first remedy which Mr. Dutt suggests is a permanent limitation of the State demand from the soil. This remedy was adopted in Bengal by Lord Cornwallis a century ago, and was proposed by Lord Canning for all India after the famine of 1860.

So long as fresh revenue settlements are made every thirty, twenty, or fifteen years, securing an increase in the demand from the soil, it is idle to talk of improvement in the material condition of the people of India. A severe famine is desolating the greater part of India in the present year, but the settlement officer is still at his work. A large increase in the State demand has been obtained from the Central Provinces of India and a large increase is expected in the Provinces of Orissa, where settlement operations are now proceeding. It were well if the people of the Central Provinces and of Orissa were assured that this large increase is the last, that henceforward England desires the cultivators of India to reap the increase in the income from the soil. A permanent limitation to the State demand from the soil would be a fitting gift from their gracious Queen-Empress in this year of the Diamond Jubilee to the impoverished people of India.

THE SECOND REMEDY—REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURE.

It is sometimes said that if the State demand from the soil be thus limited it will be impossible to meet the growing expenditure of India. That brings us to the second remedy—reduction of expenditure, especially of the military expenditure which is largely due to expeditions and defence works carried out in pursuit of Imperial policy outside the limits of India. Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt cites once again the important evidence given before Lord Welby's Commission by Sir Henry Brackenbury, and suggests that the Imperial Exchequer should pay to the Indian Exchequer not a fixed annual grant but a fixed proportion of the entire military expenditure of India:—

We would propose, therefore, that Great Britain should pay some fixed proportion, however small it might be, of the entire military expenditure of India. This would give the taxpayers of Great Britain a control, which Indian taxpayers cannot ask for, over the entire Indian military expenditure. Sir Henry Brackenbury has said that if the question of the Indian frontier was done away with altogether, the Indian army might be reduced by 20,000 British troops and 50,000 Indian troops. This means about a third of the entire Indian army. Equitably and reasonably, therefore, England might be asked to pay a third share of the entire military expenditure of India. But if she pays even a fourth or a fifth of that expenditure she would perceptibly relieve the Indian taxpayer. And the relief would come less from the contribution, directly made, than from the control over Indian military expenses which English taxpayers would then jealously exercise. From the nature of things the Indian taxpayer cannot exercise that control. When the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief consider some new expenditure necessary, there is no authority in India to ask the reason why.

But of course "the whole subject of Indian finances requires the most careful consideration." The

"Home Charges" are a large subject in themselves. "The annual exports from India exceed the annual imports of merchandise and treasure by over £20,000,000. For this excess of exports over imports India receives no commercial equivalent; it is a steady drain on the resources of India."

THE THIRD REMEDY—REFORM IN ADMINISTRATION.

In towns and in seats of government the administrative machinery has undoubtedly undergone some recent change. But in rural tracts the "one-man rule" set up by Warren Hastings remains practically unaltered after the lapse of over a century. Especially Mr. Dutt mentions the need for a change in "the comprehensive and fantastically variegated powers" of the District Officer. His position in relation to the administration of justice is merely grotesque:—

The district officer is the head of the police in his district; he directs investigation into heinous cases: he receives and peruses diaries sent up by investigating police-officers; he forms his opinion of a case from the perusal of these police diaries; and if the case appears to him to be true, he directs the case to be sent up for trial. When the case comes up, the district officer sends it to one of his own subordinate magistrates for trial, and he prosecutes the case through a subordinate police-officer. If the subordinate magistrate who tries the case is what is known in India as a second-class or a third-class magistrate, and if he convicts the prisoner, the prisoner's appeal lies to the district officer. We shall suppose, that his appeal is rejected, and a sentence of hard labour on him is confirmed: the district officer is again the head of the local gaol, and sees how the prisoner is worked in gaol. To sum up, the district officer is the police officer who directs the police investigation; he is the superior magistrate who has the prisoner tried by his own subordinate; he is the prosecutor who prosecutes the prisoner; he is the appellate court who hears the appeal if the prisoner is tried by a second or third-class magistrate; and he is the head-gaoler who superintends the prisoner's work in the gaol.

One is not surprised to read that this arrangement is needlessly making British administration unpopular in Indian districts. It is not the fault of the men, but of the methods. Here, also, Mr. Dutt calls attention to the need of entrusting the people in villages with some powers to deal with purely village concerns.

THE FOURTH REMEDY—GIVE INDIANS A REAL SHARE IN THE ADMINISTRATION.

"A benevolent administration such as India enjoys is the first essential for the well-being of a country, but it is also essential that the people should have a real and important share in conducting that administration." This can be done in two ways: (a) in fulfilling repeated British pledges with reference to the admission of Indians into the higher posts in the Government of their own country; and (b) in extending the principle of representation. There is, Mr. Dutt says, no nobler or more devoted body of public servants in the world than the English administrators who have undertaken the government of India, "but it is no reflection against these alien rulers to state that frequent and serious mistakes might be avoided, and more complete success in civil administration might be secured, if they availed themselves to a greater extent than they have yet done of the opinion, the advice, and the co-operation of the enlightened leaders of the people."

A feeling of unrest is perceptible in India, not of unrest

under the British rule, but of unrest under a form of government framed forty years ago, and which no longer suits the circumstances of the present day. There is danger in exaggerating this feeling, but it were folly to close our eyes to it altogether. And the secret of this feeling of unrest is this, that educated Indian opinion and sentiment and ambition are struggling against that cast-iron form of administration which has not expanded with the times. Indian opinion seeks to be heard, and is not heard; Indian feeling seeks to be represented, and is not represented. It is easy to condemn this desire as discontent, or even disloyalty, but Englishmen must know that it is neither one nor the other. It is a natural feeling produced by antiquated methods of government after the country has outgrown those methods. It is a feeling which Englishmen would have felt to-day, if the old system of representation had not been reformed by the Acts of 1832, 1867, and 1884.

"THE ONE WEAK POINT."

The one weak point in English administration in India is that want of sympathy which Elphinstone deplored sixty years ago, that want of touch with the people which keeps the Government ignorant of their real wants and feelings, that want of intimate local knowledge which leads even a wise administration into blunders and mistakes which sometimes result in serious consequences. It is possible to remove this want by inviting the representatives of the people themselves to co-operate more largely in the work of administration, and it is possible to enlist the natural ambition of leading Indians, the growing aspirations of educated Indians, and the willing advocacy of the press itself in the cause of British administration, instead of estranging them by an exclusive policy. An exclusive policy is, under the present circumstances, both weakness and folly; a policy of recognising the just influences and aspirations of the people is a policy of strength as well as of wisdom. The former policy makes the British administration liable to errors and mistakes, and makes the entire public opinion of the country keen and eager to criticise those mistakes. The latter policy would lessen the chances of mistakes, and would enlist the public opinion of India in the work of rectifying those mistakes. The former policy needlessly creates difficulties by excluding the people's co-operation and estranging their public opinion; the latter policy would smooth the work of administration by throwing it partly on the people themselves, and would enlist Indian public opinion in the cause of Indian administration. The former is a difficult and a thankless task; the latter would be an easy and a grateful task.

MR. COURTNEY ON INDIAN ADMINISTRATION.

We extract the following important and suggestive passage from the speech delivered by the Right Hon. Leonard Courtney, M.P., at Fowey, on October 30:—

For two years he had served on the Royal Commission which had been considering the financial position of India. In the course of a few months they would be arriving at some conclusion. But whatever that conclusion might be, it was no false anticipation to say that they would confirm the belief that India was an extremely poor country, and the difficulty of raising revenue to meet the expenditure was one pressing always upon the Indian Government, and at the present time pressing more severely than ever. . . . This opened up a larger question. After all, what was this Government of India to whom we were bound to defer, even if we thought they were wrong? Who were these ten or a dozen gentlemen who governed India? Who appointed them? How were they trained? What were their special qualifications? How were these 300 millions of people ruled? He did not intend to enter upon that question now, but it was a serious question, which would have to be very deeply considered. They could not very well have India governed by an Indian House of Commons, choosing its own Government, just as the British House of Commons chose the Government at home. Things were not ripe for that yet. Nor could India be governed by the British House of Commons as the United Kingdom was

governed. The House of Commons would be quite incapable of ruling British India in any direct fashion, and British India could not be left to govern itself. And so British India remained a question which would occupy our attention for some time; but it would have to be considered and dealt with very carefully. This happens, this little set of people in a room, collected one scarcely knew how, but there one did not know why, having qualifications of which we had no surer, was not the final system of government for India. The House of Commons never could do it, because it was already overburdened with work, and to undertake to govern India directly would infallibly break its back. But that great question would have to be considered; and, if at some future time it fell to his lot to have to address them on the question of the government of India and the problem of how to bring that government into relation with modern life and secure some interpretation of native opinion and some authority for educated English opinion, he was confident he should be rewarded with the same attention and the same intelligence they had given him that night. (Cheers.)

THE "FORWARD" FRONTIER POLICY.

SIR HENRY FOWLER BREAKS SILENCE.

The Right Hon. Sir H. H. Fowler, M.P., addressing his constituents at Wolverhampton on Saturday, November 20, said:—

The chairman has already indicated to you what is going to be the particular topic on which I am going to speak to you to-night, and it is a topic, as he said, of great importance. As Mr. Mander has said, there are many grave questions which are occupying public attention, and in the foremost place is the conflict which is now raging on the North-West frontier of India. (Hear, hear.) The nation has been thrilled with the records of heroic courage which have upheld the proud traditions of the British army and displayed the unflinching loyalty of those Indian troops who rank among the bravest soldiers in the service of the Queen. (Cheers.) But the strength and unanimity of this national feeling necessitates some reconsideration of the policy with which in the past, and I am afraid in the future, this brilliant campaign is involved. The office which I hold in the late Government requires that I should take my share, and it is no small share, of the responsibility for the action which our successors have reversed and censured. In this controversy, as in all controversies, the first step is to ascertain the facts, and as many of the criticisms upon the conduct of my colleagues and myself ignore or misrepresent both facts and dates, I am bound as briefly as I can to go into some detail in telling the story of the events which preceded the outbreak which it is now the duty of the Indian Government to suppress. (Hear, hear.) On January 1, 1895, the native ruler of Chitral was assassinated by order of his brother. A British officer representing the Government of India was in Chitral with a small escort when the murder took place, and to him the usurper sent a deputation asking to be recognised as his brother's successor. The reply was that the question would be referred to the Government of India, whose orders must be awaited. In the meantime a detachment of soldiers was sent to Chitral, and Mr. (now Sir George) Robertson, who was the political agent at headquarters, started for Chitral. He arrived on February 1. In the interval a native chief, who was no doubt an accomplice in the conspiracy, invaded the State of Chitral with a large force. Sir George Robertson took up his position in the fort, and the troops accompanying him made up a garrison of nearly 400 men. Further fighting took place, and early in March Sir George and his garrison were besieged. On March 8 I was informed of the necessity of an expedition to rescue Sir G. Robertson, and on that day I telegraphed to the Government of India authorising them to take any action that they might deem necessary to secure the safety of the British force. (Cheers.) Those men were there, representing their Queen and country, and we were bound at all cost to give them protection. That was the first consideration of the moment. (Hear, hear.) The Indian Government, with admirable promptitude, at once mobilised a large army—some 15,000 men—and prepared to cross the frontier. Chitral—a country about the size of Wales—is described by Captain Younghusband, who is intimately acquainted with the locality,

as a "sea of mountains, practically bare, except in the lower part, and it is only in small patches at the very bottom of the narrow valleys that any cultivation at all can be found." The State is bounded in the main by the countries inhabited by some of the tribes with whom we are now so easily familiar. The fort of Chitral is nearly 200 miles from Peshawar, and the army intended to relieve that fort had to march through the territory held by these independent tribes. It was, therefore, of the first importance not only to avoid conflict with them, but, if possible, to secure their friendly co-operation. To attain this object the proclamation about which so much controversy has raged was issued, in the middle of March. That proclamation stated, first, that notice had been given to the chief of the besieging army that unless he retired from Chitral by April 1 the Government of India would use force to compel him; secondly, that the sole object of the Government was to put an end to the present and to prevent any future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory; thirdly, that as soon as that object had been attained the force would be withdrawn; fourthly, that the Government had no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which they passed—(cheers)—or of interfering with the independence of the tribes; and, fifthly, that they would scrupulously avoid any acts of hostility towards the tribesmen so long as they on their part refrained from attacking or impeding in any way the march of the troops. (Cheers.) I may say I was aware of the general purport of this proclamation, but I did not receive the text until April 2.

THE MEANING OF THE PROCLAMATION.

Without discussing at present the effect of this proclamation, it is not unimportant to consider what it was then understood to mean. In the *Times* of March 23 their correspondent in a telegram describes the proclamation as stating that we did not intend to annex any territory, "but merely to compel the invading chief to evacuate Chitral." A few days later, on March 28, Mr. George Curzon, who had been Under Secretary of State for India in Lord Salisbury's Administration, and whose authority on all Eastern questions is exceptionally high, wrote to the *Times* on the Situation in Chitral, and in that letter he says: "I see that the Indian Government have issued a proclamation to the tribes to say that as soon as they have attained their object in Chitral the British force will be withdrawn, and that there is no intention of occupying the intervening territory. Of course, this may be technically true; but if this proclamation means, as it will undoubtedly be interpreted to mean, that having opened up the essential and inevitable route to Chitral, we are going to allow it again to be closed, it will be difficult to find words in which to describe the melancholy fatuity of such a decision." A perfectly fair criticism on Mr. Curzon's part, but you see what it involves. (Hear, hear.) The Indian Government in their despatch dated April 17 state that "a proclamation was issued to the people of Swat and others on the Peshawar frontier, announcing the intention and object of Government, assuring them that we did not intend to permanently occupy any territory through which the force might pass or interfere with the independence of the tribes, and promising friendly treatment to all those who did not oppose the march of the troops." The same despatch further states that after the issue of the proclamation the authorities at once commenced negotiations with the Swatis and other tribes concerned, and explained the situation to them; that our agent having learnt that some of the other tribes had been recalled to their homes, he was authorised to explain to the people the purport of the proclamation; and that one of the principal chiefs had, on receipt of the proclamation, openly declared himself a friend of the Government. Thus, we have from the press, from the official Opposition through the responsible representative in the House of Commons of the India Office in the preceding Government, from the Government of India, and from the action of some of the tribesmen, what was the general impression of the meaning of the proclamation. (Hear, hear.) I need not recall the brilliant story of the defence and relief of Chitral. On that there is no conflict of opinion. The Englishmen of to-day and the Englishmen of the future will never forget the unselfish heroism which distinguished Sir George Robertson and his comrades during that memorable siege—(cheers)—nor the splendid courage which characterized the advance from Peshawar and the march from Gilgit. (Cheers.) The controversy arises as to the conflicting policies which

followed the complete success of the military expedition. And for those policies the two Cabinets, which in turn adopted them, are alone responsible. (Hear, hear.) It was the duty of the Government of India to advise the Home Government on all the aspects, both civil and military, of the grave and difficult questions which the state of affairs at Chitral had raised. It was the duty of the Home Government to treat that advice with the greatest consideration, to appreciate the weighty arguments which had influenced the eminent men of whom the Government of India was composed, but the decision and the responsibility rested, and solely rested, with the Cabinet of the Queen. (Cheers.) Our policy with respect to Chitral was not a new question. It had occupied the attention of Lord Cross, Lord Kimberley, and of myself, and the existing arrangements were temporary. Aware of this I telegraphed to the Viceroy on March 30, that as soon as the present trouble was over our policy with regard to Chitral and neighbourhood would have to be fully and carefully reconsidered in the light of recent events, and that our hands must be kept perfectly free. "I hope," I added, "that you will take care that nothing is said or done to commit the Government either way, with regard to making new roads or retention of posts now occupied or occupation of new posts."

VIEWS OF THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT.

On April 19, the day Chitral was relieved, I asked by telegram for the advice of the Indian Government on the strategical and political importance of Chitral, and for their suggestions as to the course to be adopted in the future. This telegram was crossed by a telegram to me from India, and in that telegram the Viceroy stated that in the opinion of the Indian Government the military occupation of Chitral, supported by a road to Peshawar, was a matter of first importance, and he added: "We are unanimous in asking your permission to enter into negotiations with the tribes with the view to obtaining their consent to the opening up of this road, when, in our opinion, the opportunity arises, in connexion with General Low's advance, and in thinking loss of this opportunity would be serious mistake." It may give you some idea of the length and character of the proposed road, if I say that if on the map Birmingham stood for Peshawar, Carlisle would represent Chitral, and the Alps the intervening country. (Hear, hear.) On April 20 the Viceroy telegraphed me, in reply to my telegram which had been crossed, that the telegram which I have just quoted expressed the views of the Indian Government as to the importance of Chitral, but that without entering into negotiations with the intervening tribes he could not answer as to the extent of political difficulties or cost of road. To this I replied that I had no objection to his sounding the tribes as to the terms and conditions on which they would consent to opening and maintaining the road from Peshawar to Chitral, should this road be hereafter decided on, but I further stated that I did not wish to be committed to any policy until Her Majesty's Government had fully considered the detailed views and arguments of the Indian Government with respect to that policy. On May 8 the Indian Government sent a despatch containing their views and arguments. I was advised by telegraph as to the effect of the despatch, and also of the desire of the Indian Government that the decision of the Cabinet should be postponed until after the arrival of the despatch by mail and of its accompanying documents. The despatch reached me about the end of May—I think the 27th or 28th. It was a masterly and lucid reply to my request for the detailed views of the Indian Government upon the questions I had submitted for their consideration. The situation with its dangers was clearly set forth, and very powerful arguments were urged in favour of the policy advocated. That policy was the military occupation of the Chitral Valley and the construction of the road from Peshawar. With respect to the road, the despatch stated the difficulties to be (1) that the expense might be prohibitive; (2) that if the opening of the road meant subduing the tribes and holding the line by force, it would not only involve great cost, but many embarrassing complications. The Indian Government added that they were not convinced that these difficulties would occur. They stated that the expedition had not aroused a general religious war, that the hostility of the tribes had been exaggerated, that the leading men were amenable to arguments of utility, that the fanatical Muhammadan influence was less strong than it was believed to be, and that it might be possible to come to arrangements with the intervening tribes which, backed by force,

would be adequate to keep open a route by which troops and supplies could be sent up to Chitral. They added that without opening negotiations they could not say what chance there really was of making satisfactory and permanent amicable arrangements, and that it would be impossible, under existing circumstances, to do more than make indirect enquiries until they were informed of the decision of Her Majesty's Government on the whole policy to be adopted in Chitral. The despatch concluded with the statement that the Indian Government were fully conscious that the course which they recommended might involve the Government in an expense which the finances of India could ill afford, and in an increase of responsibilities with the tribes on the North-West frontier, which they would fain avoid.—(Hear, hear.)

UNFOUNDED CHARGES AGAINST THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

The late Government have been blamed for unnecessary delay in arriving at their decision, and they have been accused of acting with rash precipitation. Both these incoherent charges are unfounded. (Cheers.) The question was not one to be decided, as one of my critics said, in twenty-four hours. It required consultation with the highest expert authorities, both military and civil, and it demanded the fullest consideration by the Government, with whom the responsibility of the decision rested. Both these conditions were fulfilled. (Hear, hear.) The question was primarily a military one—viz., whether Chitral was of such strategical importance as to be essential as a safeguard from invasion. The Commander-in-Chief of the Indian army and the military member of the Indian Government were both of opinion that it was, and in that view they were supported by the great authority of Lord Roberts. On the other hand, Indian generals of equal weight were of a contrary opinion. Lord Rosebery's Government felt it to be their duty to avail themselves of the best military advice that they could obtain; and I say now, as I have already said in the House of Commons, that so far as military considerations were concerned, our policy was settled upon the advice of some of the most eminent military authorities in the Empire. (Cheers.) Their advice and its reasons could not be published, but I may state that the effect of their unanimous opinion was that the gigantic natural defences of the North-West frontier would not be strengthened by the military occupation of Chitral, that it was not a place of importance either as a base for military reserves or for military operations, that to lock up troops in Chitral or in the Chitral Valley would be a blunder, and that the construction of the military road from Peshawar to Chitral would be an advantage to an invading force and a disadvantage to a defending force. (Cheers.) There were many other confidential considerations of a technical and detailed character to which I cannot refer, but which strengthened the opinion of our military advisers. The occupation of Chitral depended upon opening and maintaining the road, and that, as we considered, depended upon obtaining the consent of the tribes. Civilian experts, Indian statesmen, with long experience of the frontier and of the tribes, were of opinion that to make the road under arrangement with the tribes would lead sooner or later to a control over the whole of the country through which it passed; that a policy of insisting upon open roads and respecting at the same time the independence of the tribes was impossible; that the road could not be effectually kept open and protected for any length of time by merely tribal arrangements, but would have to be protected by regular troops; and that the construction and holding of the road meant the practical subjection and annexation of the tribes and their territory between Peshawar and Chitral. After careful consideration it appeared to us that the construction and defence of the road with the consent of the tribes would be a dangerous policy; and even if such arrangements could be made they could not be relied on as of practical or permanent value. We were further of opinion that to construct the road without those arrangements would be a violation of the proclamation, on the faith of which several of the tribes did not combine against and oppose our march through their territories. (Hear, hear.) Having regard to all the considerations which I have briefly summarised, the late Government came to the conclusion that they would not be justified in accepting the proposals contained in the despatch, and they decided that no military force or European agent should be kept at Chitral, that the road should not be made, and that the army which had effected the relief operations should return to British territory as speedily as circumstances

- would allow, the dates and details being left to the discretion of the Indian Government. That decision was telegraphed to the Viceroy on June 13. The next day he replied that while deeply regretting he loyally accepted our decision, and a few days later he telegraphed the proposals of the Indian Government for carrying out our policy. On the day on which that telegram arrived we tendered our resignation to Her Majesty. (Laughter.)

TOY REVERSAL OF LIBERAL POLICY.

Now, gentlemen, I have given you a complete and, as I believe and intend, an impartial account of the action of my colleagues and myself. (Cheers.) The leader of the House of Commons has severely attacked not only our policy, but our personal conduct, and I should be wanting in my duty to my colleagues and myself if I did not take some notice of the charges which he has brought against us. He alleges that no communication was ever made to Lord Elgin that the opinion was entertained that the policy advocated by the despatch of May 8 was inconsistent with the terms of the proclamation. He emphasises this charge by insinuating that Lord Rosebery and myself, many weeks after we left office, invented the idea of a breach of the proclamation, and that our own colleagues—he mentions Mr. Morley and Mr. Asquith by name—(cheers)—were totally unaware when the Cabinet arrived at its decision that any such idea had been entertained. Mr. Balfour is incapable of making a statement which he does not believe to be true; but in this case the information on which he spoke was imperfect and inaccurate. His allegation is absolutely unfounded, and to it I give the most unqualified contradiction. (Loud cheers.) Without disclosing what was confidential, I am bound to say that immediately on receipt of the despatch of May 8 I personally communicated with Lord Elgin on this question. I frankly admit that Lord Elgin did not consider that the policy proposed in that despatch was a breach of the proclamation, and he gave me his reasons for holding that opinion. Those reasons, together with the despatch, were submitted by me to all my colleagues some days before the Cabinet meeting was held when they arrived at their decision. Mr. Balfour talks of bandying arguments backwards and forwards between the home Government and the Government of India, and he refers to some controversy about questions of expense, of policy, and of military strategy. All this is a flight of his brilliant imagination. (Laughter.) There was no controversy and no bandying backwards and forwards of any arguments. I asked, as I was bound to ask, the Government of India for their opinion. They gave it in their despatch which arrived at the end of May. They were anxious for our decision. That decision was given immediately after the consideration to which I have already alluded. Mr. Balfour talks about our overruling the Government of India. This is a complete misunderstanding, not only of the constitutional position of the Government of India, but of everything that took place between the Imperial and local Governments. The decision of this and all similar cases rests solely with the Imperial authority, and for the reason which Lord Salisbury stated in his well-known despatch where he laid down the sound doctrine that the supreme authority of Parliament is the reason and the measure of the authority exercised by the home Government in Indian affairs, that so far as Parliament is concerned no responsibility of the Government of India exists, and that the only responsibility known to Parliament is that of the Minister of the Crown. (Cheers.) The late Government were responsible for the decision to evacuate Chitral. The present Government are responsible for the reversal of that decision. (Cheers.) The late Government were of opinion that their decision prevented any violation of the proclamation. If they were wrong, they and they alone must submit to censure. The present Government are of opinion that the course which they have pursued is consistent both with the letter and spirit of the proclamation. If they are wrong, they and they alone must bear the blame. (Hear, hear.) To describe criticism or censure of their policy as being not an attack upon Lord Salisbury and Lord Salisbury's Government, but a personal attack upon Lord Elgin and his Council, is a flagrant contradiction of the facts of the case, and an unworthy attempt to hide the real responsibility of the Cabinet behind the great personality of the Viceroy—(cheers)—who pre-eminently deserves, in Mr. Balfour's own words, "the support, the encouragement, and the cordial admiration of every citizen of this country." If we had remained in

office a few days longer it would have been my duty to have sent a despatch to India putting on permanent record all the reasons which led to and justified the decision conveyed by our telegram, and our opinion of the subsequent proposals made by the Government of India. Those reasons were, however, on the very first opportunity after the general election fully stated by the late Prime Minister and by myself in both Houses of Parliament. My successor, on taking office, announced that the present Government would reconsider the Chitral question, and on August 1 he enquired as to the possibility of arrangement with the tribes for the road. The Indian Government replied that they had avoided open negotiations with the tribes, but that the reports received by them warranted the confident expectation that peaceable arrangements could be made. They also stated that no addition to the army was asked. Some days later Lord George Hamilton telegraphed the assent of the Government to the proposals contained in the despatch of May 8, subject to the condition (among others) that there should be no increase to the army; and he added, "Do nothing in any way to infringe the terms of the proclamation." A fresh despatch followed in due course, in which the Indian Secretary stated his opinion that the reports as to the expectation that a peaceable arrangement could be made as to the road, and that the army would not be increased materially, altered the position, that it removed the doubt which had been felt—not only felt by us, but by them—as to the opening up the road by peaceful means and maintaining it without an intolerable burden of expenditure being imposed on the Indian revenue. The removal of this doubt cleared away the main obstacles to the proposals in the despatch and he had thereupon telegraphed their acceptance by the Government. The Indian Secretary concludes with a paragraph which, to say the least of it, throws a side-light on some recent assertions that the idea of any breach of the proclamation was an afterthought, which first saw the light in the autumn of 1897. I quote the words of this paragraph:—"But your information is still incomplete as to the exact cost of the scheme, and I felt some doubts as to the absolute necessity of permanently maintaining regular troops on the Malakand Pass, and as to whether the tribes would see in this an infringement of the proclamation. (Cheers.) I therefore added to my telegram the injunction that the arrangements for this part of the scheme should be held over pending the receipt of fuller details of expense and a caution for strictly keeping to the conditions of the proclamation." This despatch had not been published when Lord Rosebery made his speech in the House of Lords. Lord Rosebery, however, stated the arguments which had influenced his Government in deciding against the military occupation of Chitral, and one of those arguments was the "breaking faith with the people among whom the campaign had taken place." (Cheers.) A fortnight later, when the papers had been published, a long debate took place in the House of Commons, and I then explained and defended the action of the late Government. Lord George Hamilton in his speech attacked what he called my indictment of the Indian Government with respect to the proclamation. In reply, I stated that, in my belief, Lord Elgin and his colleagues had no intention of violating the terms of the proclamation, that they believed that peaceable arrangements could be made for the construction of the road, and although I did not agree with them in this opinion I admitted that if these arrangements could be made there would be no violation of the proclamation. I added that this was a question of argument, and not one of imputation upon Lord Elgin, for whom I had a profound respect. (Cheers.) What I said then I repeat to-day, and the point at issue then was (and Sir W. Harcourt—(cheers)—in the debate urged it with great force)—could this road be peaceably made and maintained under arrangements which had any hope of permanency? The events of the last four months have, I think, decided that question. (Cheers.) Eventually agreements were made with some of the tribes for the construction and defence of the road by their levies, for the surrender of their rights to tolls and for payments to the chiefs. The Queen's speech at the commencement of the Session of 1896 declared that these agreements had been loyally carried out. In the debate on the Address Lord G. Hamilton stated that the most sanguine anticipations anyone could have indulged in had been more than realised. He congratulated the Conservative party for their true political instinct when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement, and declared his belief that "there had been no forward

movement of recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial and which would more tend to put an end to those periodical disturbances and outbreaks of fanaticism which had previously characterised that remote corner of India."

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE REVOLT AND ITS CAUSES.

Within less than eighteen months after that rosy picture had been presented to the House of Commons the tribes in the Swat Valley, through whose country the road had been opened, with whom one of the peaceable arrangements had been made, and to whose chiefs large subsidies had been promised and paid, commenced the recent outbreak. They attacked one of the fortified posts on the road, and, as one report stated, "the whole valley was up." The extent and character of this attack was of such a nature that two brigades—one containing four and the other three regiments, with three mountain batteries—were sent forward to support the garrison. After five days' fighting the force under the command of Sir Bindon Blood—about 5,000 men—completely defeated the tribes. (Cheers.) By this victory the threatened attack on the Malakand fort—the principal fort on the road—by an army of 6,000 men was prevented. A week later several thousand men of another tribe attacked one of our forts only 15 miles from Peshawar. That attack was, after fierce fighting, brilliantly repulsed. (Cheers.) The Government of India properly poured troops into the district, and by the middle of August our forces had increased to about 37,000 men. At that date, according to one account, "the tribes were all up through a mountain district 600 miles long by 200 miles broad." Then came the treacherous outbreak of the Afridis—a tribe hitherto loyal to the Government, and to whom had been entrusted for nearly twenty years the guardianship of the Khyber Pass. In September we were attacked at Nawagai. The Khan of that tribe was the chief who openly declared himself a friend of the Government on receipt of the proclamation, and his tribe attacked our forces with some 3,000 men. This tribal rising has necessitated military operations on a most gigantic scale. I understood Lord Lansdowne on November 9 to say that our forces on the frontier numbered 70,000 men—more than double the number we had engaged at Waterloo, and a larger number than have ever been engaged in conflict in India before. Lord George Hamilton tells us that not even in the recollection of those who passed through the Mutiny has there ever been so spontaneous and unaccountable an outbreak. I ask myself, and I ask you: Is it absolutely unaccountable? (Hear, hear.) The Secretary of State is of opinion that the triple visitations of famine, plague, and earthquake, combined with the repulse of the Greek invasion of Turkey, were the main causes of this outbreak. I was not aware that the frontier had been desolated by the famine or the plague. (Cheers.) Mr. Balfour tells us that the chief cause was the victory of the Muhammadan Turks over the Christian Greeks. I ask whether there has been any sign of disaffection among the 60 millions of Her Majesty's Muhammadan subjects in India? (Cheers.) Have any of the Muhammadan States sympathised with this alleged religious war? The Queen, in her gracious telegram which Lord Salisbury read at the Guildhall, expressed the intensity of the feeling with which she had heard of "the affectionate and devoted support which her throne, her cause, and her Empire had received from the native princes and peoples of India." (Cheers.) Among the most illustrious of those native princes are the great Muhammadan chiefs. (Hear, hear.) The theory that the wild mountaineers of the North-west have embarked in a crusade to destroy the British rule in India appears to me to be about as probable as that the growing dissatisfaction with the Government as shown in the by-elections is owing to the muzzling of the dogs. (Laughter and cheers.) At the time when I was considering the retention of Chitral, I was officially informed that there was a certain freemasonry among the tribes on the North-west frontier, that those who were too distant from the scene of any expedition to think of joining at once in hostilities against us began to take some interest in their fellow-tribesmen when they heard of any permanent occupation of new tracts, and that in their jealous desire to maintain their complete independence they had a common link of sympathy. It appears to me that this warning was well founded, and that it is within the range of probability that the construction of

military forts and the presence of large bodies of troops in districts beyond the frontier aroused the passionate fear of annexation, which is the hereditary passion of the tribes. (Cheers.) It is a significant fact that one of the tribes, in reply to Sir W. Lockhart's recent proclamation, protested against the occupation of Swat (the district through which the road runs) and declared that they would oppose further inroads.

WHAT NEXT?

It may be that a belief that the Chitral road and its garrisons were the first steps towards the destruction of the independence of the tribes kindled the conflagration which cannot be extinguished except at the fearful sacrifice which the telegrams from India daily record. But when the fire has been put out, when the victory has been achieved, what next? (Hear, hear.) The question not only for the people and Government of India, but for the people and Parliament and Government of Great Britain, is what is to be our future policy in the North-west of India? The respective merits of governments dwindle into insignificance when we are confronted with one of the gravest difficulties of our Indian Empire. (Hear, hear.) Anglo-Indian statesmen, both civil and military, are divided as to the wisest and safest frontier policy. One section, in view of a possible invasion of India by Russia, advocates the Forward policy. They maintain that our frontiers should be extended until they touch the frontiers of Russia and Afghanistan. They consider that the tribes which occupy the vast region of mountains and deserts which lie between us and what may be called neighbouring Powers should be subjugated and their country annexed, and that thus India would secure a scientific frontier, which would be of supreme advantage in case of any attack. The other section, who have been called the party of "masterly inactivity," maintain that every step forward weakens our defence—that our dominions are completely guarded by the mountain ranges of the Himalayas and the Hindu Kush; that we should cultivate friendly relations with the intervening tribes and respect their independence; that to conquer and hold their territory would require a large increase of the Indian army; that the additional expenditure would be an intolerable tax on Indian resources; that our true and safe policy is to develop the trade, the agriculture, the manufactures, the railways and canals, the health and education of the people of India—(cheers)—and that it would be an act of supreme folly to abandon all these enterprises in order to spend vast sums on a military policy the necessity for which has been denied by many of the most eminent Viceroy's, the most experienced civilians, and the most illustrious soldiers who have made and maintained our Indian Empire. (Cheers.) Twenty years ago these conflicting policies were submitted to the test of Parliamentary discussion. The advocates of the Forward policy, who were the authors of the Afghan war, defeated their opponents in the House of Commons by a majority of 101. The Opposition were not dismayed. When the time came they appealed to the final authority of the electorate, and the decision was reversed.

THE POLICY OF THE ENTIRE LIBERAL PARTY.

There were no speeches in that celebrated election which dealt so powerfully and so convincingly with the danger and the folly of the Forward policy in its bearing not only on Afghanistan but on the frontier tribes as the speeches of the Duke of Devonshire. He, as Secretary of State for India, in opposition to the strong opinion of the Indian Government, ordered the evacuation of Kandahar. Motions censuring his action were proposed in both Houses of Parliament. The debates were of a high order, and all the arguments for and against the Forward policy were stated with consummate ability. Lord Salisbury, Lord George Hamilton, and Mr. Balfour endorsed their disapproval of the evacuation of Kandahar with the same arguments and with the same prophecies that they have opposed the evacuation of Chitral. (Hear, hear.) In the House of Lords the majority in favour of the Forward Policy was 89. In the House of Commons the majority for the policy of the Duke of Devonshire was 120. Every member of the present Cabinet (except Mr. Goschen, who was absent) voted in those decisions, and it throws some light on the reversal of the policy to evacuate Chitral when we remember that fourteen of the ministers who made that decision voted against the evacuation of Kandahar. (Hear, hear.) And what has been

the result of our experience since 1881? I doubt whether any responsible statesman will to-day assert that the withdrawal from Afghanistan was a mistake. On the contrary, I believe—I may say I know—the vast preponderance of authority supports the opinion that the evacuation so bitterly opposed was a wise and judicious policy. (Cheers.) We have now two courses open to us. One is the occupation and administration of the whole country through which we have passed in the recent expeditions; the other is that, having shown our ability to defeat all hostile attacks of the tribes, we should leave the tribes alone, maintain friendly relations with them as far as possible, but avoid not only the annexation but the appearance of annexation of their country. (Cheers.) It has been well said that if France had a Switzerland between her and Germany, she would be safer than she is now. British India has a mightier Switzerland lying across her border. Why should we destroy so strong a bulwark?—(Cheers.) If, as Lord George Hamilton suggests, we are to construct roads, erect forts, and hold positions in Tirah and adjoining countries, we are taking the first step which will inevitably lead to conflict, to lavish sacrifice of men and money and finally to annexation. The attempt to open roads through these regions means a permanent military force; it means interference with the native inhabitants, punishment of offending tribes. That will be followed by further control, by punitive and probably rescuing expeditions, and in the end annexation. And at what cost, and to gain what advantage to India? (Cheers.) We have yet to deal with the cost of the present expedition. What that cost is I don't know, but if it approaches the figures I have seen, the Indian revenue cannot meet it, and I go further and say ought not to be asked to meet it. (Loud cheers.) Parliament in 1880 resolved to contribute five millions towards the cost of the Afghan war. The reasons which justified that vote are more forcible to-day than they were then. To throw upon India, in addition to the enormous cost and loss of the famine and the plague, the entire cost of the present war would be an injustice which would rankle in every part of the Indian Empire. (Hear, hear.) But I refer to the cost of the policy in the future. By whom is that to be defrayed? By the Indian taxpayer or by the British taxpayer? Ask the present and the late Finance Ministers of India, ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I think we shall be told that India cannot and Great Britain will not undertake that terrible burden. (Hear, hear.) On political, on financial, on administrative grounds, as well as upon the strategical grounds on which I am not competent to speak (but with respect to which I know the opinions of some of the greatest soldiers in her Majesty's forces), we oppose the policy, however disguised, which means the occupation and the annexation of the vast tracts of country now held by the tribes on the North-west. (Cheers.) The frontier policy, which we believe to-day to be the wisest and the safest and the best, was accurately defined by the Duke of Devonshire, when, as Secretary of State for India, he said: "We do not intend to trust to a scientific frontier, we do intend to look only to mountain passes and strongholds. We think that some attention should be paid to the fact that these mountain passes and strongholds are held by men, and are inhabited by men, of whom the strongest characteristic is their deep attachment to their independence. We will try to teach them once more that we ourselves respect that independence, and that in our own interest, and for the protection of our own frontier, we will assist them to maintain that independence against any comer, from whatever quarter he may come." (Cheers.) These were the words of a wise and sagacious statesman, who once led the Liberal party. I venture to say that in those words may be summed up the opinion of the entire Liberal party at the present day. (Cheers.) I have always done my utmost to keep Indian affairs outside the range of party controversy. I have felt it to be my duty (though at the cost of the most unscrupulous misrepresentation) to support in legislation and administration the Indian policy of the Government when I have considered it, on the whole, to be right. The question now before us is an Imperial question, which the supreme and final authority can alone decide. Holding as I do the strongest convictions with respect to the occupation of Chitral, the making of the military road, and the threatened occupation of the territories beyond the frontier, I am bound to oppose a policy which I believe to be fraught with danger to the safety and prosperity of our Indian Empire. (Prolonged cheers.)

THE LATE MR. J. DACOSTA.

It is with deep regret that we have to record the death of our friend and coadjutor Mr. John Dacosta, of Manson Place, Queen's Gate. Though age had been creeping on him for some years past, his usual activity was maintained until severe illness overtook him during his visit to Scotland last summer. But he was at work again on his return until the end came, somewhat suddenly, on October 15. Mr. Dacosta had spent most of his life in India, where at the time of his retirement, some twenty-five years ago, he was the senior partner in one of the oldest Calcutta mercantile firms, Messrs. Ashburner and Co.

Mr. Dacosta was one of those quiet, unobtrusive workers for the public good of whom there are too few. Never desiring to find fame, he steadily did his part year by year, persevering to the end. His chief devotion was to India and the true interests of its people. He was at one time an active member of the East India Association. Since the foundation of this Review in 1890 it has been with him a labour of love to contribute almost continuously to its columns papers and criticisms which were always marked alike by carefulness as to facts, clearness of expression, and earnestness of purpose. These may be chiefly classed under three heads: Increase in Indian expenditure and financial mismanagement; the evils arising from defective administration caused by confusion between Judicial and Executive functions; and the fatal course of the aggressive and costly trans-frontier policy, a subject which he had followed more persistently perhaps than any other writer. In connexion with this should be mentioned his little book, "A Scientific Frontier" (W. H. Allen and Co., 1891).

On the second subject mentioned above, Mr. Dacosta frequently wrote for the *Law Magazine and Review*. Many of these papers, together with others on kindred topics which appeared in that quarterly, have been reprinted under the title "Essays on Indian Affairs, 1892-5" (Stevens and Haynes). Not the least valuable is one reprinted from the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* of 1893, in which some of the byways of the fatal trans-frontier policy are described. If some of our public men could turn to these articles by Mr. Dacosta they would understand far better than many do what has led up to the present situation.

BRITISH MORALISTS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Mr. Selby-Bigge has compiled in two moderate-sized volumes a work which will be of great value to students of the history of moral philosophy. It contains copious extracts from Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, Butler, Adam Smith, Bentham, Samuel Clarke and Richard Price with shorter passages from Brown, Cudworth, Hobbes, Lord Kames, Locke, Mandeville and Paley.

The selections appear to us to have been made, on the whole, with great judgement; the most characteristic passages of each writer have been chosen and references are made in the introduction to the paragraphs in the book which are consecutively numbered. Not the least useful part of the volumes is a copious analytical index at the end, which provides for the student what he used to be asked to make for himself at Oxford—a commonplace book of

¹ Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge, M.A. Formerly Fellow and Lecturer of University College, Oxford. (Clarendon Press, 2 vols., 18s.)

the authors quoted, giving their various opinions under such heads as Benevolence, Instinct, Truth, Virtue, etc. One may hope that the kindness and diligence of more accomplished students, like Mr. Selby-Bigge, will not entirely supersede the humbler but useful efforts of our youth.

One name, the greatest of all, will be looked for in vain by the reader. No extracts are given from Hume, though he is, of course, frequently referred to in the Introduction. This is no doubt partly due to Hume's importance, which should compel every student to study him entire, partly to the fact that Mr. Selby-Bigge has edited Hume's *Treatise and Enquiries* also for the Clarendon Press. And on the other hand, one feels that such short extracts as are given, e.g., from Hobbes's *Leviathan* and *Treatise on Human Nature*, afford a very inadequate view of the author's position as a whole. Such inequalities, however, are unavoidable in a book of selections, and we must be thankful to Mr. Selby-Bigge for giving us for the first time, in so convenient a form, the main lines of thought and conclusions of the pioneers of moral philosophy in this country.

The introduction is excellent as an analysis of the leading thoughts and discussions which run through the moralists of the eighteenth century. It distinguishes clearly between the intellectual systems which would rest the sanctions of morality on certain *a priori*, immutable laws of nature, universally applicable to all conduct, and the sentimental school which finds the sanction and source of approbation and disapprobation in a special moral sense. Mr. Selby-Bigge criticises and points out the defects of both theories. But it would, we think, have been useful to supplement this discussion by more fully indicating the fundamental change in moral philosophy introduced in this century by the doctrine of the continuity and evolution of human society as a whole. As Mr. Selby-Bigge truly points out, the eighteenth century writers almost invariably treat the individual, or at least the individual generation, as the unit in their problem. When we realize, as Kant first apprehended in the most abstract form and as the sociological and evolutionary doctrines of this century have taught us more fully, that every human faculty is the necessary resultant of all previous human solution, that moral questions are only a part, albeit the highest part, of the science of life and conditioned by facts of biology and psychology, then much of these eighteenth century discussions is seen to be of little scientific value. Much is of a hortatory kind; much, too, is merely verbal distinction.

What is the meaning of "nature"? How can the passion of anger and the affection of parents be both natural? What is the meaning of virtue? Is it not the uncommon degree of a common good quality? Such questions are indeed important to settle, but they can be settled without touching the foundations of human conduct or contributing much to a truly philosophic account of morality.

Mr. Selby-Bigge will, perhaps, some day increase our debt to him by tracing in another work the growth and influence of the social and scientific psychology of this century in its relation to ethics.

F. S. MARVIN.

THE INDIAN MUTINY.

Kaye's and Malleeson's History of the Indian Mutiny of 1857-8. Edited by Colonel MALLEESON, C.S.I. New edition. In 6 vols., 3s. 6d. each. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1897.)

We need not do more than briefly mention the inclusion of this standard historical work in Messrs. Longmans' popular "Silver Library." It is now thirty-three years since Sir John Kaye wrote the preface to his work, which has since been approved by more than a generation of students and of what is called the reading public. One may safely assume that the re-issue of the volumes in their present convenient form, and at a price which brings them within the reach of all, will greatly extend their popularity and usefulness.

MR. KIPLING'S NEW BOOK.

Captains Courageous, by Rudyard Kipling. London: Macmillan and Co. 1897.

Mr. Rudyard Kipling's new book contains nothing about India. It is a delightful tract on the importance of discipline—being the story of one Harvey Cheyne, the spoiled boy of an American railroad millionaire. The boy fell off an Atlantic liner, and was picked up by the crew of a fishing-boat. The skipper thought he was mad, would not believe his story, kept him hard at work codfishing off the Grand Banks until the end of the season, and then restored him—a new being—to his astonished and delighted parents. The strength of the story lies in its enchanting and humorous description of the rough life of the quaint fishermen. Its weakness (as a tract) lies in what appears to be Mr. Kipling's demeanour towards the ostentatious magnificence of Harvey Cheyne's father. We said that the book contained nothing about India. But the skipper's son, telling Harvey of the perils of their trade, says:—

Fine weather's good sleepin', an' 'fore you know mebbe you're cut in two by a liner, an' seventeen brass-bound officers, all gen'elmen, lift their hand to it that your lights was aout an' there was a thick fog.

Does not something rather like that take place beyond the North-West frontier of British India?

Cheap Edition of Kaye and Malleeson's Indian Mutiny.

SILVER LIBRARY EDITION.

6 Vols., Crown 8vo, Price 3/6 each.

HISTORY OF THE INDIAN MUTINY OF 1857-8.

BY

SIR JOHN KAYE, K.C.S.I., F.R.S.,
AND COLONEL MALLEESON, C.S.I.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of Magdalen College, and Secretary of the Appointments Committee in the University of Oxford, acts as Guardian to persons coming to England for Education, and gives information as to the methods available of Education, General and Professional. Address Secretary, INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools), 44, High Street, Oxford, England.—(Advt.)

Printed by A. BOSMAN, 1 & 2 Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 24 and 25, Palace Chambers, London, E.W.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, E.C.]

VOL. VIII.

Parliamentary Report No. 1.

FEBRUARY, 1897.

This Supplement consists of a FULL Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from January 19th to January 26th.

Imperial Parliament.

January 19th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

The third Session of the 14th Parliament of her Majesty the Queen, and the 26th Parliament of the United Kingdom, was opened by Commission at 2 o'clock.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

THE FAMINE AND THE PLAGUE.

The LORD CHANCELLOR delivered the Queen's Speech, which contained the following references to India:—

"It is with much regret and with feelings of the deepest sympathy that I have heard that, owing to the failure of the autumn rains, scarcity and famine affect a large portion of my dominions in India. My Government in that country are making every effort to mitigate suffering and to lessen the calamity. The development of railways and irrigation works, and the forethought given through a long series of years to the preparation of the most effective arrangements for alleviating distress caused by famine, make their task more hopeful than in previous visitations. My people throughout my dominions at home and in India have been invited to second with their liberality the exertions of my Government. Papers showing the extent of the famine and the measures taken to relieve suffering will be laid before you.

"Plague has also made its appearance in the sea-port towns of Bombay and Karachi, and, notwithstanding the precautions adopted by the local authorities, shows no signs of decrease. I have directed my Government to take the most stringent measures at their disposal for the eradication of the pestilence."

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

The MARQUESS OF BATH, moving that an humble address be presented to her Majesty for her gracious speech, said: Their lordships, he was sure, thoroughly shared the regret of her Majesty that her Indian Empire should have been visited by the terrible joint calamities of famine and pestilence. The nation would expect that nothing that activity in preparation or abundance in provision could secure should be neglected in order that those painful scourges should be kept within bounds. The appeal which had been made to her Majesty's subjects at home and in India to second by their liberality the exertions of the Government had met with a prompt and a noble response, and the channel of generous sympathy would flow with a flood no less strong than marked its course 20 years ago. But amid the grief that had been universally aroused by the dread tidings from India there was one consolation, and that was

that many years had elapsed since that country had been afflicted with the horrors of famine, which he believed in former times had been more rare in their absence than in their occurrence. (Hear, hear.) The increased facilities of transport, the fruits of scientific investigation, and the improvement in organisation—in itself the result of long and painful experience—must tend to alleviate the sufferings which the marvellously patient inhabitants of India endure from those fearful visitations. (Hear, hear.)

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY, in the course of his speech, said: We next have a reference to a very sad calamity indeed which has befallen India. A famine has broken out, perhaps more extended than almost any famine there has been for a long period of years, coupled with a visitation of plague which is of a most alarming kind when joined with destitution and consequent disease in large bodies of the population. I feel the deepest sympathy with the calamity that has befallen India, but I have confidence that the Government of India, as far as human means and skill will avail, will deal promptly and efficiently with the calamity. (Hear, hear.) They have vast experience as regards the management of measures for the relief of famine. They have a very efficient staff, and I think the people of this country may rest assured that the skill, energy, and self-devotion which characterise the Indian servants, under the guidance of my noble friend, Lord Elgin, will spare no effort to alleviate the suffering. (Hear, hear.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

10. East India (Trade).—Copy of Review of the Trade of India in 1895-6, by J. E. O'Connor, C.I.E., Director General of Statistics to the Government of India.

East India (Famine and Relief Operations).—Copy presented,—of Papers regarding the Famine and the Relief Operations in India during the year 1896; with Copy of the Famine Code for the North-West Provinces and Oudh [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Loans raised in England).—Copy presented,—of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1896, &c. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Loans raised in India).—Copy presented,—of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1896, &c. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Superannuation Allowance).—Address for "Copy of Correspondence between the Secretary of State for India and the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, regarding the Superannuation Allowance of Major-General Sir

Owen Tudor Burne, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I."—(Address 19th January, 1897; Secretary Lord George Hamilton); to lie upon the Table.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

THE FAMINE AND THE PLAGUE.

Sir WM. HARCOURT, in the course of his speech, said: I need not say how deeply we all feel the disasters which have befallen our Indian fellow-subjects, and I need say no more upon that matter than that I am perfectly certain that the people of this country, whether individually or through the Commons' House of Parliament, will take care that every alleviation of those sufferings will be given which the Government may think it fit to propose. (Cheers.)

CHITRAL AND KAFIRISTAN.

Sir C. DILKE, in the course of his speech, said: Since the debates of last year the question of Chitral and Kafiristan had arisen. Full details had come from Afghanistan and the frontier provinces as to the treatment extended by the Afghan troops to the unfortunate inhabitants of Kafiristan. If the facts were as had been alleged in a pamphlet issued with the authority of the Bishop of Lahore and others, nothing more horrible had occurred in the history of the relations between civilised and uncivilised people. The Amir had received from us that which was not ours to give—namely, a large tract of Kafiristan. The Amir sent to that country a large force, which was provided with arms by us and which was paid by us, and the unfortunate people made a complete political submission to it. But the people stipulated for the free exercise of their religion, and the Amir's commander-in-chief boasted of having promised to them this while he intended all the time to break the promise.

Lord G. HAMILTON said he had not seen or heard anything authentic in support of that allegation. Could the right hon. baronet give him the facts or a copy of the document, because his information was to the contrary effect?

Sir C. DILKE said that all the evidence in his possession as to the authenticity of the statements which had been published in India convinced him. As, however, the noble lord had not seen the pamphlet, he would send a copy to him.

January 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE INSURANCE FUND.

Mr. LOUGH asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state to the House what was the amount paid in to the credit of the Indian Famine Relief Fund since the famine of 1877; what was the total amount of withdrawals from that fund for purposes apart from the relief of distress during the past 20 years; and what amount remained to the credit of the fund at the commencement of the existing famine; and what was the estimated requirement of the Government of India for famine relief during the next three months.

Lord G. HAMILTON: There is no Indian Famine Relief Fund in the sense indicated by the hon. member. The amount of taxation imposed for Indian famine relief and insurance was in 1877 estimated at Rs. 1,104,900 annually. Owing to the Afghan war the scheme did not come into operation for four years; and, if those be excluded, the total receipts are estimated at Rs. 16,513,500. The expenditure has been—On construction of protection works, Rs. 12,004,022; on reduction or avoidance of debt, Rs. 5,327,299—total, Rs. 17,331,321. It is difficult to forecast the exact expenditure upon famine relief for the next three months, as the numbers fluctuate so greatly from week to week, but the loss caused by famine directly and indirectly for the financial year 1896-97 will certainly exceed three and a-half crores of rupees.

Mr. LOUGH asked if he was to understand that some part of the cost of the Afghan war was defrayed out of this fund.

Lord G. HAMILTON said that when a country was involved in war it was obliged to put on one side the ordinary financial operations. During the time the Afghan war continued the money raised by this taxation was not available for famine insurance.

Dr. CLARK enquired how much was spent on railways.

Lord G. HAMILTON: A very large proportion. It was never intended that the fund should be put in a separate box and allowed to accumulate.

THE PLAGUE AT BOMBAY.

Mr. CALDWELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the attention of the Indian Government had been called or would be called to the necessity of having suitable hospital accommodation at Bombay for the isolation and treatment of cases of plague; and whether, in view of the great suitability of the military lines and cantonment at Colaba for such a purpose, the Indian Government would find other accommodation for the troops in Bombay.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The attention of the Government of India has been called to the necessity of providing suitable accommodation at Bombay for the isolation and treatment of cases of plague; but I do not propose to interfere with their discretion in regard to moving the troops from Colaba, or using the barracks as plague hospitals. I understand that temporary hospital accommodation of a suitable kind could easily be erected on the open ground in and around Bombay.

THE FAMINE AND THE PLAGUE.

SUGGESTED REMISSION OF THE COST OF THE INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Mr. LAMBERT asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the grave reference in her Majesty's gracious Speech to the famine and plague in India, he would consider the advisability of remitting to the Indian Government the cost to them of the Indian troops engaged in the Egyptian expedition.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I can quite understand and sympathize with the feeling that has prompted this question, but the two subjects which are referred to in it are quite distinct, and I have no reason whatever to suppose that the Indian Government would at all desire that they should be coupled together.

A GRANT IN AID TO INDIA.

Mr. MAULEAN asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the enormous loss of revenue which India would suffer through the prevalence of famine and plague in that country, her Majesty's Government proposed to invite Parliament to vote a grant of public money in aid of the Indian Exchequer.

Mr. BALFOUR: I have to say that the Indian Government are in no lack of funds, and, until we know the outcome of the famine expenditure and the loss of revenue caused by that, it is premature to discuss the assistance of a grant of public money from the Imperial Exchequer. There is no precedent, so far as I know, for any such course.

January 22nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE AND THE PLAGUE.

Sir A. SCORLE asked the Secretary of State for India what steps had been taken by the Government of Bombay to deal with the bubonic plague now prevalent in that Presidency; and whether he had approved of the measures which had been adopted.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The extreme gravity of the subject to which my hon. friend's question refers will justify me in making a longer reply than is usual to ordinary questions. (Hear, hear.) The plague was identified at Bombay in September last. On the 2nd of October wide powers were conferred on the chief executive officer of the city, who is a Government official, to take whatever measures were found necessary to prevent the epidemic from spreading. Large sums of money were voted for the purpose by the corporation. The Government appointed a special committee to investigate and advise; scientific experts came from other parts of India to report upon the disease and its prevention; while additional medical men and a large staff of workers were employed to carry out at once the special sanitary measures in

Bombay advocated by the committee of experts. The epidemic appeared to be abating in November, but from the 1st of December it grew more severe. The plague spread to Karachi in December, and is now suspected to be epidemic in Poona. Over 2,500 plague deaths have occurred in Bombay, over 300 in Karachi, and about 100 sporadic cases elsewhere. As the House is aware from newspaper telegrams, the plague has caused much terror among the people of Bombay and in the adjacent country, but the disease has not so far appeared in epidemic form at any place besides Poona outside the cities of Bombay and Karachi. The sporadic cases of which I spoke, excepting at Poona, occurred almost entirely among fugitives from the two plague-stricken cities. The efforts of the Government and of the corporation, between whom hearty co-operation exists, were devoted to relieving sufferers from the plague, to checking its extension in Bombay and Karachi, and to preventing its spread elsewhere. Hospital space was increased, special plague hospitals were provided for six different sections of the community, and are being prepared for two other sections. House-to-house visitation of infected quarters is being carried out under medical supervision. Every suspected case of plague that is not at once removed to the hospital is isolated as far as practicable. Every house where a plague case has occurred is disinfected, and is, as far as possible, vacated, temporary accommodation being provided elsewhere. Insanitary houses are pulled down, in others partitions are removed or ventilation introduced. Special sanitary precautions and improvements have been carried out in the backward parts of Bombay city. A fuller staff of doctors and Indian medical men is being organised, and the Bombay Government will indent on England for a temporary staff of doctors and nurses, if more aid is required. To prevent the spread of plague to other parts of India, passengers leaving Bombay, Karachi, or Poona by rail, road, or sea are inspected by medical officers, and persons travelling or alighting at the larger stations are stopped and removed for treatment if they are suspected of being plague stricken. In case pilgrims to the Moslem holy places might carry plague into the Red Sea, the Government of India have—as empowered by law—declared that from February 1st Bombay and Karachi shall cease for the present to be ports of departure for pilgrims. The Bombay Government report that the corporations are granting all necessary funds, while the executive and medical officers there and elsewhere are doing all that can be done, though prompt suppression of the epidemic has not been attained. The Government of India report their belief that the arrangements at railway stations for checking the spread of disease are working well; but they are enquiring whether further measures are needed, which, if necessary, will be given. I believe that these remedial and precautionary measures are daily becoming more stringent and more effective; neither self-sacrificing work nor money is being stinted. If it has been difficult to secure the co-operation of some sections of the Indian population to promote the sanitary and preventive measures for the arrest and stamping out of this pestilence, yet in other quarters loyal assistance and effective self-help have been displayed. I am hopeful that the continuous energy and vigilance shown by the Government and the local authorities, and the rigorous measures they have adopted, are beginning to make real impression upon that epidemic, and that we may for the future note its decline. I should add that the experts some time back expressed the view that during the winter months some increase in the epidemic might be expected. As I came into the House I received a telegram from the Governor of Bombay to the effect that he learns that alarmist and greatly exaggerated telegrams in reference to plague are being sent from Bombay, and he hopes that great caution will be shown before accepting the information as true. Only four pure Europeans have died of the plague, including a doctor and a nurse. Amongst the dock labourers and Port Trust servants the deaths and sickness are very small indeed.

Mr. MACLEAN asked whether the noble lord was aware that both the Sanitary Commissioner and the health officer of Bombay had frequently protested against the imperfect sanitary arrangement of that city, and whether any measures had been taken to remedy an admitted evil.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I understand that as far as practicable efforts are made to improve the sanitary conditions of the native quarters, but I am afraid until the epidemic is over it will not be possible to embark on a wholesale measure for that purpose.

Sir A. SOOHLI asked the Secretary of State for India a question of which he had given him private notice—namely, whether he could give the House any recent information as to the number of persons employed on relief works in India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The latest telegram I have received on the subject is from the Viceroy, and is dated January 22. It reads as follows:—"Famine. Rain during week in affected districts, from one to three inches in Punjab except the Delhi division, few light showers elsewhere. Condition of standing crops fair to good in Central Provinces, Behar, North-West Provinces except in Bundelkhand districts. In affected districts of Bombay crops are suffering from want of rain. Prices have fallen slightly in Northern Punjab, stationary elsewhere. On relief:—Punjab, 70,000; North-West Provinces, 795,000; Central India, 42,000; Rajputana, 28,000; Bengal, 278,000; Burma, 30,000; Madras, 29,000; Bombay, 265,000; Central Provinces, 211,000; total, 1,750,000. In Bombay apparent increase due in part to omission of non-working children in former reports."

January 25th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LOSS OF THE "WARREN HASTINGS."

Colonel LOCKWOOD asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether he was in a position to state if, at the time or since the wreck of the Indian troopship "Warren Hastings," which occurred on the 14th January, 1897, on the Island of Reunion, with headquarters 1st battalion King's Royal Rifles, and half a battalion York and Lancaster regiment on board, any of the officers' and men's baggage, men's property, etc., was saved.

Mr. BRODRICK: It is known that a small quantity of cabin luggage was saved from the troopship "Warren Hastings," and it is hoped that more baggage and the regimental plate may yet be recovered.

Mr. THORNTON asked what had become of the crew.

Mr. BRODRICK thought that the crew were on the Island of Reunion. He believed that all were saved but two natives.

HEALTH OF THE TROOPS IN INDIA.

Colonel LOCKWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the Army Medical Report on the health of the troops in India, the Government would enquire into the whole facts of the case. He desired it to be understood that he referred to one particular form of disease.

Mr. DARLING asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to a statement in the *Times* of Friday last, to the effect that it was alleged in India that 522 soldiers per 1,000 were now incapacitated from duty by reason of contagious disease;

And, whether the Government proposed speedily to deal with this question to prevent this evil from rendering inefficient the forces of the Crown in India, and from endangering the health and the lives of people in this country as the troops returned home.

Major RASCH asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the admission to hospital for venereal disease of the British Army in India amounted to 536 per thousand for the year 1895, an increase of 25·2 on the previous year;

And, what steps the Government proposed to take in the matter.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I propose to reply to my hon. friend's question and to those of the hon. members for Deptford and South-East Essex together. It is the case that the total aggregate admissions to hospital for venereal disease among the British troops in India amounted in the year 1895 to 522 per 1,000, but this does not mean that 522 men per 1,000 were separately and individually admitted, still less does it indicate that 522 soldiers per 1,000 are incapacitated for duty from this cause. It is calculated on the latest returns that an average permanent deduction of 46 per 1,000 is the loss entailed by these diseases. The facts as to the serious increase of this disease in India are now being enquired into by a departmental committee, on receipt of whose report her Majesty's Government will carefully consider the whole subject.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: May I take the 522 per 1,000 men to mean men who have passed through the hospital suffering from this particular form of disease?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Yes. It means the total number of admissions, but the same man may be admitted more than once.

Major RASCH: Can the noble lord tell us when the report of the departmental committee will be in the hands of members?

Lord G. HAMILTON: No, sir. There is certain further information which may take a short time before we obtain it. But I think that in the course of a few weeks the report will, I will not say be in the hands of members but, certainly concluded.

AUSTRALIAN AND INDIAN MAILS.

Mr. HENRIKER HEATON asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether contracts for the conveyance of the Australian and Indian mails had been concluded; and, if so, when would they be laid upon the Table of the House; and whether the protests and requirements of the Australasian Governments on the subject would be laid upon the Table before Parliament was asked to confirm the contracts?

Mr. HANBURY: Although the Postmaster-General has recently, with the concurrence of India and the Colonies, accepted tenders for the conveyance of Indian and Australian mails, the contracts are not yet drawn. They will be laid upon the Table of the House as soon after signature as possible; but the correspondence on the subject is not of such a nature that the Government would think it necessary to lay it on the Table of the House.

Mr. HENRIKER HEATON asked if the right hon. gentleman was aware that the Australian Governments had published the contracts?

Mr. HANBURY: I am not aware.

January 26th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN FAMINE AND THE SALE OF SILVER.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, as the Indian peasantry would be compelled by the famine to sell their hoards of silver at a heavy loss, through the mints being closed and the depreciation of silver bullion, it would be possible to make arrangements at the Government treasuries in the famine districts for the purchase of silver ornaments at a fixed price per ounce.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The form of relief suggested in my hon. friend's question is not one that I am prepared to recommend to the Government of India, for, amongst other disadvantages, it is open to this practical difficulty, that, if it were once known that the Government would purchase silver ornaments at a price above their market value, those who would derive most benefit from this philanthropic venture would be well-to-do persons who could purchase silver ornaments wholesale. I may add that, although the divergence between the exchange value in gold of a coined rupee and that of an equal quantity of uncoined silver has undoubtedly increased since the mints were closed, it does not follow that the purchasing power of silver bullion in India has fallen.

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether any decision had yet been arrived at with regard to the various questions of exchange compensation, particularly in relation to officers whose salaries were regulated by statute, and questions arising from domicile; and, if so, whether he could state the decision arrived at, or would agree to present the correspondence on the subject.

Sir G. HAMILTON: The subject of Exchange Compensation has been, for some time past under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council. We have made some progress towards settling some of the questions involved, but there are others of a very complicated and far-reaching character still to be considered. I hope that a general decision will be given before long.

THE ADDRESS.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN'S AMENDMENT.

WANTED: ENQUIRY INTO THE CONDITION OF THE INDIAN MASSES.

The debate on the Address was resumed by Sir W. WEDDERBURN, who moved as an amendment, to add the following words at the end of the Address—And we humbly pray that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct that a full and independent enquiry shall forthwith be made into the condition of the masses of the Indian people, with a view to ascertain the causes by reason of which they are helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine and pestilence.

He said that he was sure that India would feel grateful for the expressions of sympathy contained in the Queen's speech, and for the assurances that the State would do all in its power to save life. But he felt it his duty to move his amendment, because the Government did not seem fully to realise the nature and magnitude of the calamity. The methods of State relief adopted, sought to mitigate the outward symptoms, but they did not tend to remove the cause of the evil, which was the extreme poverty of the masses. So far from removing this evil, the expenditure on famine relief aggravated it. He did not know how much would be spent, whether three millions, or six millions, or three times six millions. But where would this money come from? It would not come down from the clouds. It would have to be raised by the taxation of the masses; the dying would be fed at the expense of the hungry survivors, making the survivors more destitute, more heavily burdened, and less able to resist hunger and disease. Also he felt it his duty to place prominently before the House the Indian view of the calamity and its proper remedies. These remedies were not heroic ones, but they proceeded from an intimate knowledge of the condition and habits of the people. If it were asked from what sources Indian public opinion could be learnt, he would say, from his friend Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, a true well-wisher of British rule, from the Indian Press, and from the resolutions of the Indian National Congress, which gave voice to the public feeling in India. The view held in India with regard to the famine might be briefly expressed in three simple propositions. The first was, that the excessive mortality in time of famine was owing to the chronic destitution of the masses, who existed precariously on the verge of subsistence. He hoped that the noble lord, the Secretary of State for India, would not deny the truth of this proposition. It was true that in the Queen's Speech, the cause of the famine was declared to be the "failure of the autumn rains," but he assumed that was only stated as the immediate cause—the last straw which broke the camel's back—and that the noble lord looked further back for the causes of the rayat's feeble powers of resistance. How, indeed, could the proposition be denied? For it stood to reason that the population must be living from hand to mouth, if, on account of the failure of one harvest, they died of hunger, not by hundreds and thousands, but by hundreds of thousands, and millions. If, however, the extreme destitution of the people was denied, he trusted that the House would call for enquiry, and insist on this issue being fairly tried, as between official optimism on the one hand, and unanimous Indian public opinion on the other. His second proposition was, That mortality from famine would practically be prevented if the rayat possessed a store of food, money, or credit sufficient to tide over one failure of harvest. This proposition seemed to be self-evident. For men did not die from hunger out of mere perversity, but because they had neither food in their houses to eat, nor money to buy it, nor credit to borrow it. As a class the rayat had not only nothing, but much less than nothing, being hopelessly in debt to the village money-lender. He remembered that in the early part of his service in India every rayat, however poor, had a little store of grain put away in a store-room under his house, sufficient to last his family two or three years. But that was now impossible, for we had set up debt courts upon the European model, and these little stores were swept away by the bailiffs in execution of decrees. The first step towards helping the rayat was to release him from this bondage and the money-lender. His third and last proposition was a more hopeful one, and it was this, that if certain

simple remedies were applied in the village administration, the rayat would not only possess a sufficient store, but might become comparatively wealthy. In approaching the question of the rayat's condition the important fact must be borne in mind, that, although India was at present a very poor country, she possessed almost boundless possibilities of wealth. She had a fertile soil, an unfailing sun, an abundance of labour, skilful and cheap. All she wanted was working capital. If the rayat had that in sufficiency at reasonable rates, to provide himself with water and manure, he would turn all India into a garden. He (Sir W. Wedderburn) had seen this operation going on near Poona, where land that produced a crop of millet worth perhaps ten shillings an acre was, by irrigation and manure, made to produce a crop of sugar cane worth £30 an acre as it stood on the ground. And such was the skill of the rayat that whatever crop he produced, whether rice, indigo, opium, tea, wheat or tobacco, it in the end always came to the top of the market. From these three propositions would be seen the nature of the enquiry which he asked for by the amendment. What he desired was a village enquiry, practical and definite, in order to ascertain in detail the condition of the rayat, to learn the causes of his poverty, and to apply remedies to the evils from which he was suffering. The enquiry he wanted was a village enquiry, because in the rural villages were included 80 per cent. of the population, and because the village community was the microcosm of all India; and if they could discover the means to make one village prosperous they held the clue to make all India prosperous. For such an enquiry no Imperial Commission was necessary. The local administration might be directed to select typical villages in each Province, and to appoint a Committee to make a thorough diagnosis of their condition. The Committee must be representative, consisting of Europeans and Indians, officials and non-officials; such as were appointed to the Deccan Rayats Commission 20 years ago. Their investigation should be of a microscopic kind, to detect the microbes which blighted the rayat's prosperity. He believed that the microbes would be found to be the usurious money-lender (who should be replaced by Agricultural banks); the Civil Court (which should be replaced by popular Conciliation and Arbitration Courts); and the harsh and rigid collection of the revenue (which should be replaced by methods suited to the habits and wishes of the rayat). If these simple remedies were adopted he believed that famine would be rendered impossible. In making these proposals he did not desire to impute any blame to the noble lord, the Secretary of State for India; but he had carefully studied the condition of the rayat for thirty or forty years, and in this great crisis he desired to place the results of his experience at the disposal of the noble lord and of the House. He earnestly trusted his proposals would receive sympathetic consideration. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. H. J. Wilson seconded the amendment. He was glad, he said, that his hon. friend had pointed out that it meant no attack upon the Government, for they recognised with satisfaction and pride the efforts that had been and were being made in this country, and had no doubt the Government was doing whatever it could to deal with the immense mass of misery and suffering which must inevitably ensue. But prevention was better than cure. If there were remedies the sooner they were known the better. No blame was imputed by the supporters of the amendment against the present or any other Government. What they asked for was an enquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether anything could be done to prevent these recurrent famines. The poverty of India was, he supposed, admitted by all, but he doubted greatly whether the real extent of that poverty was generally known. The right hon. member for Wolverhampton, on a former occasion, had explained that the taxation of India amounted only to half-a-crown per head of the population, but that sum in India meant something very different from what it did in this country, for the wages of ordinary labourers in many parts of India were only a shilling a week, whereas here wages of £1 were not considered high. In a conversation with Mr. Haridas Voharidas that gentleman told him that the Native Princes in many cases screwed more out of the people than we did, but that their methods were more elastic and that they did not exact taxes in hard times. Our methods, on the other hand, were inelastic and pressed with great severity on the people in periods of distress.

Sir James Fergusson said that the mover of the amendment had spoken with studied moderation, and the tone of his speech

would command itself greatly to the approval of the House. (Hear, hear.) He could not agree with him in his wholesale condemnation of administration in India, and the hon. member had not made a very extensive foundation for the very wise and far-reaching enquiry which he now proposed. When the hon. baronet was in that country his views on the question of administration were not in harmony with those of the great majority of the members of the service to which he belonged. He held, in opposition to the hon. member, that the papers presented to Parliament and the statements made on behalf of the Government showed that they recognised to the fullest extent the magnitude of the disaster that had befallen India. But for a great many years our Government and the Government of India had been making preparations to meet emergencies of this kind. Up to the present there had been no excessive mortality in consequence of the scarcity in India. A few days ago a correspondent of the *Times*, who had been through some of the famine districts, wrote that he had not come upon one single case of death from destitution. That was a most gratifying statement. The deaths had as yet been extremely few, and for that they had to thank the preparations of the Government. The people of India were better off now than in past times. No doubt the cultivators were indebted to the money-lenders, but the extent of that indebtedness was not as great as it was half a century ago. As a result of the enquiry made by the Deccan Agricultural Rayats Commission, legislation was promoted to relieve the people from the consequences of their indebtedness. Courts of conciliation were founded on Eastern habits, and they to a great extent had prevented the impoverishment of the rayat, owing to his incautious indebtedness, and had made the money-lender more careful. The Government of India had extended that system, and by irresistible evidence it had been shown that it had improved the material condition of the people. He said without fear of disproof that the system of land assessment which had for many years been pursued in India was more fair than the old system. The rayat only paid according to the capacity of the land, and until the last severe famine in Southern India the amount of revenue not collected was altogether unimportant. He was surprised to hear it said that the native system of collecting in kind was preferable and more fair. That system had been abandoned, because it was found to be so oppressive and so troublesome to the people. Native chiefs had told him that they were most glad the old system had been abolished, because it was so full of abuses and so oppressive to the people. He had himself seen the grain brought into fenced enclosures so that the people could not touch it until the agent of the State came round, took his proportion, and carried it away. If the agent was not honest he exacted bribes from the people to measure their grain in such a way as to let them off more easily, and under that system the number of petty exactions were infinite. To restore the system of payment in kind would therefore be to restore a crop of abuses from which most happily they had rescued the people. (Cheers.) Something had been said as to India's immense capabilities. We had been developing those capabilities by carefully selected public works, and if the present terrible disaster did not result in India's great impoverishment, it was because by carefully selected measures and public works we had for many years past been setting up the surest and most effective system of famine relief. Since he went to Bombay in 1880 the railways of India had been doubled. It might now be truly said that there was no place in the tracts of country now threatened with the famine which was more than fifty miles from a railway station. In former times of famine it was impossible to throw grain into the country because the water springs had dried up, and the other possible means of transport were not available because pack animals could not travel through the country. But now the grain, through the natural operation of commerce, flowed to the threatened districts like water running down a hill. We had, besides, constructed enormous irrigation works. When he was in Bombay they constructed three enormous systems of irrigation, each system irrigating a hundred miles of country. In those parts of the country where in 1877 no green blade was seen, now enormous tracts of crops were to be found independent of a rainfall. It could not be said, therefore, that nothing had been done to develop the resources and capabilities of India and to give reasonable help to the rayats. The House also knew that the assessments were not harsh. They were carefully regulated according to the capabilities of the soil, and in

such a time of scarcity as the present the assessments due to the State were suspended with no sparing hand. The Government of India and the Secretary of State were in possession of the most exhaustive reports, and the library of the House was full of the results of previous enquiries into the circumstances mentioned by the hon. baronet. In addition to that there was abundant proof that the enquiries had not been undertaken in vain. Every possible means had been taken to relieve the necessities of the people of India, and to enable them to surmount of India to meet this great crisis without damage to the people. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. J. HERBERT ROBERTS said the more he thought of the day had such a divergence of opinion between members of the House, as experience as Sir W. Wedderburn and Sir J. Lubbock, as to the necessity for some further enquiry, the more he was disposed in himself the necessity for some further enquiry. Sir W. Wedderburn, he would point out, did not say that he had not made an enquiry. He made it perfectly clear that he had made an enquiry he asked for was a limited one, and that the Government and extent. No matter what had been done by the Government in the way of taking measures to relieve the distress of famine and spending money on what was called the Famine Fund, it was well for the British House of Commons to know that it was in sympathy with the efforts that were being made by the Government in touch with regard to information as to the state of affairs connected with the condition of the Indian people. (Hear, hear.) In the great famine of twenty years ago, the number of people who died was lower than 2,500,000 people who were killed in the great Famine Fund. Five and a half million people died in the great famine of twenty years ago, and the large sum of money was given in private charity by the people of Great Britain. He rejoiced with Sir James Fergusson that the state of things was not so serious as in 1876-77, but he thought that the state of matters was, at all events, approaching somewhere near the seriousness of the famine of 1876-77. With regard to the area affected by the famine, he found it was at the present moment 136,000 square miles, and the population affected, according to Lord George Hamilton, was 37 millions—quite as large a number as was affected in 1876-77, while the number of Indian people who were seeking relief on the 22nd January had reached a total of 1,200,000. These facts sufficiently proved that there was no need of very great seriousness in the present position. As to the famine of twenty years ago, a very important Commission was set on foot to enquire into the condition of India in relation to these recurrent famines, and as a result a Famine Fund of £1,000,000 a year was started, which was raised by contributions to India. He thought it should be made clear in connection with this fund, that the view held at that time by those who were responsible for the initiation of the fund was that every year, regularly and rigidly, the money should be contributed and put up for the express purpose of alleviating distress in future periods of famine. Were they in a position to say that this had been done? Were they in a position to say that they had borrowed £10,000,000 on the security of the money raised for famine relief in that country? Owing to the Afghan war they were told part of the money had been expended for other purposes. He held a very strong opinion that the money had not been expended for other purposes, but that it had been expended for other purposes. But not only had part of the money been expended, not only had it not all been collected, but it had not been used properly. From 1881 to 1886 Rs. 1,50,00,000 was expended on the purposes of famine relief, and Rs. 1,50,00,000 was expended on irrigation, which he admitted was a very good use to be kept in view, 10 per cent. of the whole was expended on railways, the amount expended was 10 per cent. He did not wish for a moment to question the wisdom of such a means of providing relief in view of the fact that it could submit to the Secretary of State that the total sum raised was rather a large percentage of the total sum raised for the special purpose. He believed that the Government had made to relieve that the British Government had a keen interest in the administration of India, and that the reason he could not help regretting that some of the great desire being expressed to open a Ministry of India, and to provide relief in the present emergency, was that the Government should have found it impossible to do so, and that the suggestion. (Hear, hear.) He found some of the recommendations of the Report of the Commission of 1876-77 on the famine of 1876-77, and he now wished to ask the noble

whether those recommendations had been carried out, whether he considered them appropriate to the present condition of India, and whether the administration of the Famine Fund that issued out of that enquiry had been properly carried out?

Mr. M. M. BHOWNAGGERE wished to point out the very mischievous effect that would be produced in India by the acceptance of the amendment. He did not pretend to represent the whole of India, as perhaps, the hon. baronet the member for Banff wished the House to believe that he himself did—(laughter)—and he was not an influential member of that microscopic body, the British India Committee. But he would say that the mischievous effect of the hon. baronet's amendment would be more far-reaching than was supposed by the hon. baronet. At the present time, the Government in India, whether it was the supreme or the provincial Government, was doing its best to meet and cope with difficulties which were not due to human deficiencies, but which represented the visitation of Providence. To take advantage of such an occasion, and indirectly to cast a slur on the Governments which were valiantly and actively coping with the difficulty, was, to say the least of it, not to show gratitude for services which were undoubtedly entitled to recognition by the House of Commons and the British nation. (Cheers.)

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: I must point out that I cast no slur on the Government. I even said that India would be grateful for the exertions which were being made.

Mr. BHOWNAGGERE said that he had heard of three cheers being given for the Queen at meetings full of disloyal sentiment. (Laughter.) The hon. baronet's amendment was practically a vote of censure, not only on the Government of India, but upon the India Office and all the provincial Governments. The hon. baronet said that the people of India would be grateful for what had been done, while, in the same breath, he charged the authorities with neglecting a most elementary duty. The hon. baronet said that his amendment contained self-evident propositions, but the whole tenour of the amendment and the manner in which it was proposed were simply calculated to advertise a certain class of agitators, who were never tired of impressing upon the people of India the inadequacy of British rule and the want of sympathy between the rulers and the ruled. The hon. baronet said that he was uttering the sentiments expressed by Indian public opinion. Where had Indian public opinion called for this enquiry? Had not that opinion been manufactured in a small room, not far from the House of Commons; sent out thence to India; brought back in the form of newspaper articles, and passed off on the House of Commons as the public opinion of three hundred millions of people? These proceedings were not worthy of one who had been a member of the Government of India, and who was now a member of the House of Commons. To show how the innocent-looking amendment of the hon. baronet had a bearing on proceedings far off he would read a sentence from an Indian newspaper which had arrived by the last mail. The chairman of the National Congress, of which the hon. baronet was so fond and which he was always trotting before the House—(laughter)—said "that the famine was a reason not for holding no session this year, but rather for persisting in hobbling it and making it as grand as possible, for these miseries of India were due to the evils of which the Congress had been agitating the redress." That was to say that the want of rain in India was due to the grievances of which the agitators had complained. By the next mail news of this amendment would go to the people of India who were not as a rule acquainted with the procedure of Parliament. The story told to them would be that the great and only friend of India in this House, the hon. member for Banff (laughter) had proposed something by which plague and famine were to be avoided; that the Secretary of State, from hardness of heart and want of sympathy, had refused the proposal, and therefore that the right hon. gentleman and the authority which he represented were the enemies of the people. Knowing this, as the hon. baronet must know it—and, if he did not, he was sorry for him—(laughter)—was he right in bringing forward the amendment at all? The National Congress inspired the amendment, and that Congress was reported in this country by the microscopic body called the British India Committee. That Committee gathered up a number of passing schoolboys who were going

in for the Bar, and its great supporters, of course, were the hon. baronet (Sir W. Wedderburn) and another gentleman whom his constituency would not elect again. (Ministerial laughter.) It sent out appeals for hard cash, and when the appeals were not responded to, this was the way the Committee wished to press its importance upon the people of India. "We say unto you we have piped unto you, and ye have not smiled." (Loud laughter.) "We have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented," and with this sickly amendment—(laughter)—the hon. baronet came down to the House. He approved of the objects of the Congress, but he disapproved of its methods. He hoped it was the last time that he should have the painful duty of protesting against these manoeuvres, which did no good to India, and promoted dissatisfaction in the place of the gratitude for which the British Government had so often been praised on the Indian people. (Ministerial cheers.) He expressed the great satisfaction and contentment which prevailed in India in relation to the measures which had been taken to arrest the great disaster of the famine. The people, he said, and the breadth of India there was no need to call for any more forwarding forward so literally to meet the needs of India. He was expressing the sincere and hearty satisfaction which he had heard and witnessed throughout the country to the British nation at large, and the Indian people.

Mr. SCHWARTZ said it was no doubt a good thing for the splendid utterance of the hon. member for Bedfordshire to get down. Some excuse could be found for his utterance, in the fact that he had not received in his constituency the enthusiastic reception as that accorded to Mr. Nassau. All the demonstrations got up in behalf of the hon. member had, in fact, turned out to be a complete fiasco. (Opposition cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BROWN said: That is a perfect fiction. (Laughter.)

Mr. SCHWARTZ repeated that the expected demonstrations proved to be a complete fiasco. The Indian people knew their own friends, and it was perfectly absurd to say that any small body of men could agitate and conduct a reception like that given to Mr. Nassau. It must be admitted that in the administration of a country with 300,000,000 of people many questions arise which ought to be brought to the ear of the House of Commons, and as the opportunities for discussing Indian matters were few and far between, he thought his hon. friend the member for Bedfordshire was well advised in moving his amendment to the Address. He was glad that, so far as the objects of the Indian Congress were concerned, they had the full sympathy of the hon. member for Bedfordshire. Those members of the House who were members of the Congress were in some respects but the mouthpieces of the facts and details and figures sent to them from India. He did not see how any one could find fault with the amendment. Of course no supporter of the amendment expected that the Government could regulate the weather, which was the great cause of the famine in India. The chief importance of the amendment was that it proposed that some standing cause which produced famine in India and which tended to lessen the means of livelihood of the Indian people should be required into. They all knew that the military expenditure in India was a great drain on the resources of that country, and though he did not say that the cause of it could be removed, something might be done to mitigate to some extent the chronic low standard of livelihood in India. The amendment simply suggested that the Government should take action as soon as the present famine was over to examine the conditions under which our Indian fellow subjects lived. He joined with the last speaker in commending the wonderful effect that was being made by the English people to assist their fellow-subjects in India, and he believed that all her Majesty's officials in that country would do all that was possible to alleviate the sufferings which the natives of India were now bearing. (Opposition cheers.)

Lord G. L. said: The speech of the hon. baronet the member for Bedfordshire was a great surprise to me. It is impossible to remember the hon. member's speech with the amendment he was moving. The House to-day. The amendment asks "that a free and impartial enquiry shall forthwith be made into the causes of the miseries of the Indian people." At the present moment the Government of India are engaged in what is not only a task but to be one of the most serious and difficult tasks that have ever been imposed upon the Indian Administration on behalf of suffering humanity, and which imposes a strain upon the whole administrative machinery of the country that it can scarcely stand. And yet the hon.

baronet comes down to the House and proposes that a certain portion of the forces of the Indian Government which are now warring against the advances of famine and plague shall be removed from the region of action to the region of speculation, and required to devote their attention not to the consequences of famine but to the causes of famine. (Ministerial cheers.) A more inopportune moment for such a proposal could not be imagined. Let the hon. baronet reflect on the importance of his amendment. It asks for a full enquiry into the condition of the masses of the people of India. The masses of the Indian people constitute one-fifth of the total population of the globe. This enquiry would enable every single act of the whole administration of India—judicial, administrative, and financial—to be brought under the survey of the persons engaged in the investigation. They would be enabled to go into every custom, tradition, or habit of these 300,000,000 of people, and to discuss every variety of their married life from polygamy to polyandry. (Laughter.) A more vital and far-reaching enquiry could not be conceived. (Hear, hear.) I cannot be able to say that the hon. baronet made a more sensible speech than I thought would have been possible on such an amendment, and he advanced some practical suggestions. But what the House has to consider is the amendment before it. I agree with my hon. friend the member for Bedfordshire—who made a very effective and proper speech on the amendment—that this amendment emanates from the Indian National Congress. That body never loses an opportunity of attacking the Indian Administration and of endeavouring to diminish the influence of that Administration over the people of India. They passed a resolution in reference to the action taken by the Indian Government to mitigate the Indian famine. Everyone knows that the Government of India are leaving nothing undone to cope with that calamity. I say the forces of civilisation were never better organised than they are now in the fight against pestilence and famine—(hear, hear)—and those gentlemen who meet in the Indian Congress know that no native rules ever attempted to oppose the advance of famine on so large and so successful a scale as the English rulers of India are doing now. (Ministerial cheers.) Yet those gentlemen find fault with all that has been done, and they insist upon a national appeal to the country, which, however, they do not seem inclined to initiate themselves. The hon. member for Bedfordshire, who has just come back from India, vigorously attacks the policy of the Indian Congress. I am glad he makes a strong protest against the absurd assumption of a number of gentlemen, who, as has just been admitted, take all their facts and figures from India without analyzing them, and arrogate to themselves the representation of millions of the people of India. (Ministerial cheers.) There never was a more preposterous claim; the hon. member for Bedfordshire, who has the confidence of many sections of the Indian community—I do not suppose he claims to represent them all—(laughter)—has effectively ridiculed it. (Hear, hear.)

Sir W. Wedderburn: Will the right hon. gentleman read the resolution of the Indian Congress to which he objects?

Lord G. L. said: Yes; it is the following resolution:

Resolved, This Congress deploras the outbreak of famine in a more or less acute form throughout India, and holds that this and other famines which have occurred in recent years are due to the great poverty of the people, brought on by the drain of the wealth of the country, which has been going on for years together, and by the excessive taxation and over-assessment consequent on a policy of extravagance followed by the Government, both in the civil and military departments, which has so far impoverished the people, that at the first onset of scarcity they are rendered helpless, and must perish unless helped by the State or helped by private charity. In the opinion of this Congress the true remedy against the recurrence of famines lies in the adoption of a policy which would enforce economy, husband the resources of the State, and foster the development of indigenous and local arts and industries, which have of late been extinguished, and help the introduction of modern arts and industries. In the meantime, the Congress would appeal to the Government of its solemn duty to save human lives and mitigate human suffering by the provisions of the famine relief fund, in the opinion of the Congress, instead of the expenditure on wars, armaments, and oppressive taxation. And would appeal to the Government to redeem its pledges by restoring the Famine Insurance Fund (keeping a separate account of it) to its original footing, and to apply it

more largely to its original purpose—viz., the immediate relief of the famine-stricken people." Everyone that was at the Congress must know that that resolution is both ungracious and ungrateful. (Ministerial cheers.) The next resolution calls "the attention of the Government to the deplorable condition of the poorer classes in India, full forty millions of whom, according to high official authority, drag out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation even in normal years," and suggests that they should be exempted from the payment of certain taxes. I do not, therefore, wonder that the hon. member for Bethnal Green should enter a vigorous protest against this preposterous assumption on the part of a committee sitting in England, and I am certain that when his speech is read in India it will be acceptable to very large masses of the people of that country. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, the hon. baronet seemed to indicate that if the enquiry was made and effect given to the recommendations of such a body it would be possible to stop famine in India. I contest that altogether. It is much better to look facts in the face. An hon. member who supported him described famines as terrible and inevitable incidents in India. I thought that was a happy expression. Famines are terrible and inevitable incidents. I think it is a mistake and is wrong for any member of this House to hold out the hope that any remedies which he can suggest can prevent famines from desolating India. What is the problem we have to face? There are three hundred millions of people in India, and over eighty per cent. of these are entirely dependent on agriculture. The one industry upon which they subsist is agriculture, and wherever a great community is entirely dependent on one industry, and whenever the raw material of that industry fails, you cannot avoid great distress and famine itself. Rain is the raw material which is essential to agriculture in the East, and whenever rain fails not only is there great scarcity of food, but there is a total cessation of employment. In this country there are many diverse trades and industries, but wherever you have a community which is entirely dependent on one industry, and if the raw material of that industry fails, there must be intense distress. Take the cotton famine in Lancashire, that affected probably the richest community in the United Kingdom; but because everybody there was deprived of the raw material great distress ensued. Therefore so long as India remains a purely agricultural country, and so long as agriculture depends on rain falling within certain periods, when rain does not fall then distress must be widespread and great. And on the present occasion the difficulty with which we are dealing is one of a very exceptional character. It is not, as the amendment indicates, the first attacks of famine with which we are now dealing. The hon. baronet's amendment suggests that the masses of the Indian people are helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine and pestilence. I repeat that the hon. baronet knows that this famine now occurs owing to a total failure of rain on the top of a number of bad seasons, and that is what makes the position so serious. I do not believe that any famine has occurred of which we have any record in which there has been so wide an area of scarcity over a district so large, and where very high prices now prevail. I am glad to say that there is an enormous improvement in the machinery of the Government by which they can conquer famine. I happened to be Under Secretary for India, and spokesman for India in this House in 1874, 1877, and 1878, and it is most gratifying to notice how the Indian Government and people have developed and improved all their machinery for dealing with these evils. I do not know if any member of this House has looked at the famine code which is at the end of the return which I have laid on the Table of the House. It is well worth studying; it is a masterly document which has been in the course of preparation for many years, and certainly shows with extraordinary clearness and detail how the forces available to cope with famine are mobilized. I am glad to say it shows that we are much better able to combat the effects of famine now than ever before. I go so far as to say that if we had had to deal with the present difficulty twenty years ago the mortality that is already reported would have been enormously increased. Whilst on this subject I should just like to notice one or two observations which the hon. member for Denbigh made in reference to the famine fund. It happened that I was Under Secretary at the time the famine fund was established, and all the papers relating to the subject presented to the House at that time bear my name, and I cannot understand how any body of gentlemen can go on

repeating that there has been any infraction of the promise made by the Indian Government in regard to that fund. The hon. member for Manchester has explained how these charges are made; they are founded on papers coming from India, the accuracy of which is not tested by the gentlemen who make use of them here. Sir John Strachey never established a famine insurance fund in the sense which the hon. gentleman described. The position of affairs at that time was financially somewhat difficult. Every ten years after India had been transferred to the Crown there was great difficulty in establishing an equilibrium between income and expenditure, and then occurred a series of famines which entailed upon the Government a net outlay of fifteen millions sterling. It is quite clear that if the Government had every ten years to spend fifteen millions sterling on famines, which they did for a period of fifty years, financially they were in a very unsound position. And therefore Sir John Strachey endeavoured to increase the resource at the disposal of the Government by imposing a certain amount of taxation, and he proposed by an ingenious contrivance to raise an insurance fund which in the first year he estimated would amount to £1,500,000, or a crore and a half of rupees. But he never undertook in any way that this should be a statutory famine fund, and that the money should be placed in a box and allowed to accumulate; on the contrary, right throughout his speech he combated that view. He went further. He was a man of exceptional ability and of rare administrative experience, and he knew perfectly well, what any man in this House knows, that if in a particular year you try to appropriate a certain sum annually to a specific purpose emergencies may afterwards occur which will prevent the money being so appropriated. It has happened over and over again in this House. I recollect a Bill brought in by which twenty-eight millions sterling was annually voted in payment of debt and as provision for a sinking fund. Circumstances occurred under which it was necessary to reduce that provision, but nobody contended that there was any gross breach of faith. Sir John Strachey, to make it clear that under certain conditions this money might not go to the specific purpose, used very plain language, which has never been quoted. He described how he proposed to give effect to this intention. "It is," he said, "the firm intention of the present Government to apply the funds now to be provided for this special purpose strictly to the exclusive objects which they were designed to secure." Those words are always quoted and circulated, and the last sentence which I am now going to read is also quoted, but the intervening part is always omitted: "In such matters, no doubt, governments cannot fetter their successors, and nothing that we could now say or do would prevent the application of this fund to other purposes. Without thinking of a future far removed from us, events might, of course, happen which would render it impracticable even for us, who have designed these measures, to maintain our present resolutions,"—he, of course, had in contemplation the emergency of a war or a similar difficulty. "So far, however, as we can now speak for the future, the Government of India intends to keep this million and a-half as an insurance against famine alone. In saying this I should explain that we do not contemplate the constitution of any separate statutory fund, as such a course would be attended with many useless and inconvenient complications, without giving any real security. Unless, then, it should be proved hereafter by experience that the annual appropriation of a smaller sum from our revenues will give to the country the protection which it requires, we consider that the estimates of every year ought to make provision for religiously applying the sum I have mentioned to this sole purpose, and I hope that no desire to carry out any administrative improvement, however urgent, or any fiscal reform, however wise, will tempt the Government to neglect this sacred trust." (Hear, hear.) Not a farthing of this sum has ever been appropriated to carry out any administrative improvement or fiscal reform. (Hear, hear.) Since that fund was established a very large sum has gone to the prevention of famine throughout the country. Of course, it would have been useless to put so much in one box by itself and to add to the debt by borrowing an equivalent amount. In the same way, during the time when the exchange value of the rupee fell heavily, the Government were compelled to make a reduction in the amount which applied to the famine insurance; but the outcome of the arrangement is that after twenty years the Government are able to say that they have realised two-thirds of Sir John

Strachey's most sanguine expectations. Two-thirds of the maximum amount which he proposed to devote to famine insurance has been so applied. I will undertake to say that any statesman or financier who is able to frame a scheme which is liable to be affected by nearly all emergencies, and yet who at the end of twenty years has realised two-thirds of his most sanguine expectations is a most successful administrator, and no allegation ought to be made either against him or against his successors for breach of faith. I do think it is desirable that this matter should be made clear once for all. No famine fund in the sense suggested by the hon. gentleman was ever established. Sir John Strachey from first to last maintained that the object of this fund was, if possible, to reduce the debt, and he concluded his last speech in words which exactly describe the present position of the Indian Government. "I think, my lord," he said, "that I have now made it sufficiently clear how we propose to apply the £1,500,000 which we hope to provide as an insurance against famine. We shall apply it virtually to the reduction of debt; and when the calamity of famine actually arrives, we hope not only to be able to meet it without throwing fresh burdens on the country, but to find that our means of giving efficient relief have been immensely increased by the useful works which we have carried out in the preceding years of prosperity." That is exactly the position of the Indian Government at this moment. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman asked me how the necessary funds were to be provided for the cost of the famine. I am glad to say that the Indian Government are in no want of funds. If it had not been for the catastrophe of the present famine we had hoped that there would have been a large surplus this year, and we should have hoped that we might have then been able to remit certain portions of the existing taxation of India, but in view of the expenditure which will be caused by the exceptional difficulties of the present situation there will, no doubt, be a deficit at the close of this year. The position of the Indian Government to meet emergencies is immeasurably stronger than it was twenty years ago. The hon. baronet states that the great mass of the people of India have deteriorated, and are now less able than they were to meet pestilence and famine. I say there is not one iota of evidence to support that. All the facts point the other way. If the hon. baronet will look at the reports of independent witnesses on the various relief works, notably those of the Punjab, he will see that, by universal concurrence, it is admitted that the people are now about to meet emergencies in a way they could not years ago. From the papers laid before Parliament it will be found that in the North-West Provinces the people are fighting against the exigencies of the present situation with a courage and confidence never before shown. (Cheers.) Whatever test you apply to India as a whole you will find that the community have prospered, and that the mass of the people are better off than was the case twenty years ago. But I admit that there is one side of the problem which requires attention—namely, the enormous increase that has taken place in the population of India. The House is, perhaps, not aware that during the last twenty years the population of British India has increased by 50 millions. A certain proportion of the increase is due to annexation, but the greater portion consists of an ordinary and legitimate addition to the normal population. Scarcity of food, to a certain extent, always prevails in certain parts of India, and also a considerable amount of pestilence and disease which affect mortality in other parts. Yet the Government of India have so managed affairs during the last 20 years that the increase of population in that country has been greater than in any other part of the world. Of course, there is always in India an enormous class of people which exists entirely upon charity and which has done so from time immemorial. But, contrasting the present condition of affairs with that of 20 years ago, I say the people are better able to withstand emergencies of the present kind than they were then. Twenty years ago a Commission was appointed to inquire into the methods which had been adopted to avert famine, and it made reports and suggestions which formed the basis of the present Famine Code. Therefore, the Government are in a better position, as protectors of the people against famine, than they had ever been before. I agree with the hon. baronet that the opportunity this famine affords ought not to be allowed to pass without our taking every opportunity to inquire into and ascertain the best methods of protecting the people of India from the recurrence of similar calamities. No doubt the reports which will be made to the Government and

received by the Viceroy will contain suggestions in various directions and suggest improvements. If the Government do their part, may I suggest that the hon. member might do his. He informed us that one of the great evils of the present day in India was the manner in which money-lenders made use of Civil Courts. But they are represented in the Indian National Congress. (Laughter.) If the hon. baronet will be good enough to exercise his influence to try and induce them to make humane use of the Courts of law it may add to the effect of his appeal. I think I have shown that there is no need for the House to accept the amendment. All the hon. baronet proposes will be done by the Government itself, and I think if the House were to accept the amendment it would cause great surprise in India and be interpreted there as a censure not only on the Indian Government but upon the Government at home. (Cheers.)

Sir H. FOWLER: I am sure the House and the country will agree that the first duty of Parliament in this crisis is to support to the utmost of its power, morally and in other modes, the Government of India in fighting this gigantic contest against two great calamities which are almost overpowering that country at the present time. The Government of India is confronted by a terrible famine and a terrible plague, and I think certainly there is no period in modern Indian history when the Government was confronted by two foes of such magnitude at the same time. Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to minor points our first duty is to strengthen the Administration in carrying out, as I believe they are carrying out with the greatest ability, the work now before them. (Cheers.) I should not have intervened in this debate except on one ground, and that is that there has been an amount of misconception and misunderstanding with reference to the Famine Insurance Fund which cannot be too soon or completely explained away. We see and hear ugly words—and if they are ugly words in England they will be still more ugly words when translated into the vernacular in India—to the effect that the Government of India—not merely the Viceroy and his Council or the Secretary of State and his Council, but the British Parliament—have all been guilty of what has been called a breach of trust—an abandonment of a sacred trust—that something has been done with public money that ought not to have been done. That I know to be an absolutely groundless impression—(cheers)—which ought to be removed. My hon. friend the member for Denbigh indicated what I may call the prevailing impression by apportioning in various percentages the appropriation which had been made of the fund. He stated that two per cent. had gone in relief of famine; sixty per cent. in the construction of railways (which he thought a large proportion); and the remainder in the reduction of debt, to which he took exception. As the noble lord has explained to the House, the Famine Insurance Fund is the surplus revenue. It is nothing more nor less than a sinking fund. An assumed surplus of Rs. 1,500,000 was to be applied in four distinct ways—first, in the relief of any existing famine in the year in which the money was raised; secondly, in the construction of irrigation works for the prevention of famine; thirdly, and principally, in the construction of those protective railway works (to which the right hon. baronet who was formerly Governor of Bombay has alluded) which were intended to alter the state of things which caused such a calamity in 1877—namely, the impossibility of conveying food actually in existence to the parts of the country that needed it; and, fourthly, it was to be applied to the reduction of the Indian Debt. Why? Upon the very principle—to which the former and present Chancellor of the Exchequer have called attention—of the Sinking Fund of this country. By paying six millions a year towards the reduction of the National Debt the Chancellor of the Exchequer put into the hands of the Executive Government of the day a power of borrowing in case of emergency equivalent to the capital value of that fund. Therefore, the paying off five or six millions of debt means that, supposing the present calamity required it, the Indian Government would be in a position to borrow nearly six millions, practically without adding to the debt of India. The noble lord told us what Sir John Strachey said when the scheme was propounded. I will read what he has written within the last two years on this question after having seen the working of the scheme:—"This policy of insurance against famine was simple in its nature, but it has been constantly misunderstood. It has often been supposed that a separate fund was constituted, into which certain revenues were to be paid and which

could only be drawn upon for a specified purpose. No such impracticable notion was ever entertained, and every idea of the kind was from the first repudiated by the Government and by myself, who was responsible for the original scheme. The 'Famine Insurance Fund' of which people have often talked never existed. The intention was nothing more than the annual application of surplus revenue to the extent of Rs. 1,500,000 to the purposes I have described. Financial pressure has sometimes made it impossible to make the full annual grant under the famine insurance scheme, but substantially the system has been successfully maintained." That is the story of the "Famine Insurance Fund," and if Sir James Westland's financial statement of a year ago is referred to it will be seen how much revenue has been set aside for this purpose. During the 15 years the fund has been in existence Rs. 17,644,185 has been appropriated to it, and only in a small number of years has there been any reduction in the surplus. In the years 1881-2-3-4-5 the whole amount was appropriated; in 1887-88 the amount was suspended. In 1889 it was reduced to one million; in 1890 it was one million; in 1891 it came back to one and a-half million; in 1892-93 it was one and a-half million; in 1894 it was 1,489,000, and last year by the Act of the Legislature—the wise Act, I think—the amount was reduced from one and a-half million to one million. I do not wish to weary the House, but I should like to give hon. members the facts of the fund. There has been applied, in actual famine relief, 312,000; in the construction of irrigation works, 800,000; in the construction of protective railways, about ten millions; and in the payment of debt, over five millions. And Sir Charles Elliott, the late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, who was the secretary of this Famine Insurance Fund, and knew all about it, after expressing, in words even stronger than those I have quoted from Sir John Strachey, the utter delusion as to there being any separate fund in existence, and that the Government had no other object in view than the construction of these protective works and paying off the debt, calls attention to the magnificent irrigation works to which the hon. baronet has already alluded, and which have been constructed between 1870 and to-day. I venture to say there is no parallel for it in the history of the world. (Cheers.) No Government has ever constructed such magnificent works as have been constructed in India for the protection of that country against famine. (Cheers.) Then as to the railway system of India. There have been something like 10,000 miles of railway constructed over the period which I have mentioned, and Sir Charles Elliott says, with reference to 5,000 of those miles, that they were demanded exclusively almost for the purpose of protection against famine, and he shows how every one of those railways, which were mentioned in the Famine Insurance Fund Commission, has been constructed and completed, with the solitary exception of the East Coast Railway, which, I believe, is now in hand under the noble lord's administration and rapidly approaching to an end. Of course, we are entitled to have our difference of opinion. I have a strong opinion of the goodness of the Government of India. Some of my hon. friends do not think it so good as I do. I think it a wise, a strong, and an economical Government—(Ministerial cheers)—a Government which has conferred upon India untold blessings. (Ministerial cheers.) I do not believe in what is called "the economic drain" from India. That is rather a favourite phrase in the present day, and I do not perhaps accurately understand its meaning. No money is sent from India to this country which does not either repay the interest on capital which has been sent from this country to India, and which has been employed in the construction of the works which have been such a great boon to the people, or in payment of services amply and richly deserved by the English Government in carrying on the government of India. (Cheers.) I fully appreciate—the House knows that perfectly well—the very heavy drain upon India by the depreciation in the value of the rupee, but Sir John Strachey, in the book from which I have already quoted, says that the cash advantage to the people for whose use these railways have been constructed is something between fifty and sixty millions sterling per annum. I think the entire loss to India on these railways, which entirely arises from the depreciation in the value of silver—because if we were still at the old rate of ten rupees to the sovereign there is a large profit—is something like two and a half millions of tens of rupees. That represents "the economic drain" from India in respect of these large works. (Hear, hear.) Whatever our differences of opinion may be, I

think we shall all concur in thinking that the Government of India, supported by the Government at home, are doing the very utmost to grapple with this calamity. I have myself gathered, from what the noble lord has said, that he is perfectly satisfied with the effect of these protective works in preventing loss of life. It does seem to me very gratifying that no loss of life has yet occurred, and I think it is the duty of the Government to prevent any human being, any subject of the Queen in India, losing his life from starvation. (Hear, hear.) Then, I think, when you have passed the starvation limit and come to compassionate relief, that is the sphere for private charity. I take this opportunity of saying that I hope the Government of India have not closed their minds finally as to the question of an Imperial contribution—(cheers)—not to the national relief fund, but to the Indian Exchequer. I understood the right hon. gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury to say that the time has not yet arrived to consider that question. I quite agree with him; but if it should prove to be the fact, notwithstanding the surplus of which the noble lord has spoken, that this famine will entail, as I am afraid it will, a very considerable charge upon the revenues of India, for the loss from the land revenue will be considerable, I think that is the time for this House, and I am sure this House will be really representing the people of the country, in the same spirit in which it made a contribution in the case of the Afghan war to the Indian Exchequer, to make an Imperial contribution to the Exchequer of India in aid of the taxation of India. (Hear, hear.) It would be in relief of the whole people of India, and it would be a sum given by the whole people of Great Britain. (Cheers.) It would not, in my opinion, in any way interfere with private charity. I am only throwing that out as a suggestion, as a hope that the Government have not finally made up their minds as to this matter. There is one other suggestion I would make to the noble lord. It is in reference to the question whether the money paid at the relief works is entirely in cash. I would suggest whether it would not be desirable—perhaps this is an economic heresy—to consider, though it was an unfortunate word to use, the introduction of something in the nature of the Truck Act there, so that you could pay these poor people on these relief works in grain instead of in money. The object of that would be to prevent grain being forced up to an extreme price by competition. I believe the noble lord is perfectly sound in the view that he took that it is not the duty of the Government to buy and sell grain; but I would suggest whether, as in this country, under our administration of the Poor Law, a certain amount of relief is given in kind, a certain amount could not be given in India in these cases. It is quite certain the Government could buy at a much lower rate than the poor people themselves could buy, and perhaps of a better quality too. I apologise to the House for having detained it so long. (Cheers.) I hope my hon. friend will not put the House to the trouble of dividing upon this question and will withdraw his amendment, which can have no practical value at the present time, and which would be very much misunderstood in India if it were passed. (Hear, hear.) It will be much better to send forth a united message to the people of India that this House, representing the people of Great Britain, will do all it can in order to mitigate those two terrible calamities which are now devastating the country. (General cheers.)

Mr. MACLEAN said he heard with pleasure the right hon. gentleman's expression of opinion that this country should in case of need give a national contribution to the Indian Exchequer. They ought not, he thought, to underrate the immense amount of pressure that was going to be brought to bear upon the finances of India by this famine. While not in any way joining with the hon. baronet opposite and his friends in their talk about British rule having impoverished India, he admitted that of late years England had pressed too hardly upon the resources of India, and that to a certain extent India had been impoverished and unfairly used by the very great burden cast upon her taxpayers for the maintenance of such an extensive scheme of frontier defence as they were called upon to support. (Hear, hear.) He had always maintained that in this matter India ought to have some support from the Imperial Government. He joined in the eulogiums upon the servants of the Government of India for the efforts they were now making to save life in that country; but he must say he had seen a certain holding back on the part of the Central Government, which he very much regretted, and an attempt to minimise the awful suffering of the people of India at the

present moment. The Governor of the North-West Provinces of India, in his admirable speech of November 23rd, had said that he was anxious to hold a public meeting for the purpose of obtaining subscriptions from charitable persons in order to meet the distress among the poorer classes which was likely to be caused by the famine and the plague. The Government, however, after taking a whole month to consider the subject, came to the conclusion that the time had not come when it was necessary to take that course.

The SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. gentleman is now discussing the conduct of the Government with reference to the existing famine and plague in India. That is not raised in the amendment. The amendment only raises the pre-disposing causes of the famine and plague.

Mr. MACLEAN said that he thought that as a certain latitude had been allowed to other hon. members he might be permitted to refer to those subjects which, in his view, were of real moment to the Indian people. He could only deprecate the action of the Government of India in endeavouring to minimise the effects of the famine and plague in that country. It was impossible to exaggerate the horrors which were afflicting the people of India as the result of that famine and plague; while he did not hesitate to give credit to the Government for what they were now doing to relieve the distress in India, they ought to look at what was going on with the view of giving India our assistance as a nation. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. CLARK said that he was in India during the famine of 1877-1878. The Indian Government had then created a special famine fund from the proceeds of two new taxes—namely, the income-tax and the assessed taxes. At that time Sir John Strachey, the then Finance Minister, had pledged himself that those taxes should only be imposed for a year, and that their proceeds should be applied only to the relief of the distress

present caused by the famine. It was, however, now clear that that pledge had been broken, and that the proceeds of the taxes had been used for the purposes of the Afghan and Burmese wars. He recollected that some dozen or fifteen years ago he had been chairman of the British Indian Committee, of which the hon. member for Bethnal Green had been a member, and had expressed some strong views—

Mr. BROWNAGGARD said that there was no such committee sitting fifteen years ago, and that he certainly had never served upon it.

Dr. CLARK said that the hon. member must recollect that they were both on the committee to which he referred.

Mr. BROWNAGGARD said that he denied that such was the case.

The SPEAKER—Order, order. These personal questions are a long way from the amendment before us. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. CLARK said that he had only referred to the matter as the hon. member had made statements which had reflected upon the motives of the hon. baronet, the member for Banffshire. The noble lord had practically admitted all that the hon. baronet had contended for. The noble lord had asserted that there had been a vast improvement in the condition of the agricultural classes in India during the last 30 years, but that he denied, because, in his opinion the improved condition of India was to be attributed not to agriculture, but to manufactures and commerce.

The House divided upon Sir W. Wedderburn's Amendment, when the figures were:—

For the amendment	90
Against	217
Majority against	127

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE GREEN, LONDON, S.W.]

VOL. VIII.

Parliamentary Report No. 2.

MARCH, 1897.

This Supplement consists of a FULL Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from February 1st to February 23rd.

Imperial Parliament.

February 1st.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

LORD KINNAIRD rose to ask her Majesty's Government what were the number of relief camps at present established in the famine districts in India, and at what distance they were situated apart; whether the Government could state how often each relief camp was visited by a British official or other European member of committee; whether they could furnish statistics showing the increase of mortality in the famine districts during the past few months, whether the Indian Government were taking any measures to store grain in remote districts more than 30 miles from a railway or large navigable river, whether the Government still declined to store and sell grain, and resolved to leave the safety of such remote tracts to the action of private individuals; whether such a policy of abstention was not essayed both in Orissa in 1886 and in Southern India in 1877, and whether the result was not in both cases that prices mounted to five and, in some cases, ten times their ordinary figure, followed by uncontrollable calamity and hundreds and thousands of deaths? He said that he wished to refer shortly to the experience gained in past famines, especially in the famine of 1877. In that year it appeared "that prices were quoted week after week at five and six times and even eight times those ordinarily current, yet the same cold meaningless formulas were week after week published: 'supply sufficient,' 'supply middling,' 'supply fair,' 'supply plentiful,' 'supply enough.' As if this could by any possibility be the case contemporaneously with a continuation of such prices. In only one district, Kaladgi, was it occasionally hinted that the supply was defective. Early in January, 1877, the prices there were quadrupled." Yet no steps were taken by the Government to import food. "The month of August found the Viceroy officially announcing that the price of food averaged five times, in many parts eight times, that of ordinary years; it was admitted that success had not attended the efforts to save life. Success indeed had become impossible in the face of that one cardinal error of non-importation. The Madras Relief Committee was then telegraphing to the Lord Mayor, 'Middle classes exhausted, owing to famine prices,' and even in towns and centres of civilisation, those below the middle classes were dying in thousands. In the one district of Salem half-a-million persons were missing, the greater majority of whom had perished from starvation. In the more distressed parts of Madras it was officially admitted that probably about 20 per cent. of the population had disappeared, and in those of Bombay about

12 per cent. It was at the close of the famine officially recorded that in 95 distressed taluks, 10 in Bombay, and 15 in Madras, 856,000 persons out of a population of less than five millions were missing." These records showed that the questions standing in his name on the Paper, referred to a subject which called for immediate attention. In paragraph 42 of the Famine Code, it was laid down that: "Only in very exceptional cases, and in the last resort, will Government take direct action to import grain, and Government will not interfere with private trade, so long as that trade is able and willing to place food at reasonable prices, within the reach of the distressed people. If compelled to interfere because grain is not in, or is withheld from a local market, Government will do so only until the ordinary course of trade is restored." It seemed that Government did not contemplate taking any steps merely on the ground of high prices. Thus, if again, as in 1887, prices should rise to five or six times that of a good year, and should be impossible for the great majority, and at the same time, as in 1877, supplies should be officially returned as "sufficient, plentiful, fair," no action would be taken. Nor did it seem that Government would take action in any case save in "very exceptional cases and in the last resort." If Government was to wait for that stage, and only then to set about making purchases in distant lands, how were the people to subsist during the month or six weeks that would certainly elapse between the inception of Government action, and the arrival of the grain in those parts? Those parts would always be the ones most difficult of access, to which transport would take longest. It was only by being already prepared, by having stores available in remote parts to be drawn upon at once on the occurrence of such a condition of things, that a disaster can be averted. And high prices should be an essential element in deciding Government when to open its stores. If it were when importing to declare that its price would be 18 lbs. per rupee (a price never yet exceeded for long without a grievous calamity) and that it would never move from that, private trade would have a degree of security and certainty concerning its operation which now with "corners" and "rigging" it had not. That merchants admitted; but they were terrified at the idea of Government changing its rate from time to time—a fatal policy. Government had, in accordance with the policy thus laid down in its Famine Code, refrained from importation and sale. It had, at the same time, assembled huge masses of people on to its works—in some cases about 30,000 on a work of no very great extent. The only provision the Code made for securing that the money wage paid these workers could procure grain was this: "One or more contractors may be appointed for each circle by the collector." But this contractor was not a salaried servant, and he, himself a local grain dealer, could surrender at a moment's notice. There was nothing to prevent him from breaking his contract, and leaving the labourers one morning with nothing to eat. There was nothing to prevent him from doing this at any moment in case of a combination among dealers. Of course

he might be proceeded against in the Civil Courts, but of what avail would litigation of that sort be in saving life? Two mornings ago, Reuter's agent reported from Bijaout, a work with 5,000 persons on it where no provisions were supplied, the labourers having to come into Bijaout, six miles, to effect the necessary purchases. And so far, we were only at the beginning of the difficulties. The Secretary of State in his despatch of 15th January, 1897, recognised that, in October last, in 74 districts the cheapest kinds of grain were dearer than 20 lbs. per rupee. He anticipated that distress would increase till April, possibly to the end of May, and would not subside till August or September. He approved the decision of the Indian Government "to abstain from any interference with the operations of the grain trade," and added, "its operations, so long as they are effective, must not be subjected to competition by Government agency." No one would for a moment suggest anything else than what was contained in this last sentence; but it was where, by absence of supplies or by impossible prices, private trade showed that its operations were not effective, that Government must sell if a whole population was not either to starve or to be brought on to the relief works, and the calamity was to be checked from becoming uncontrollable. If that was so, it followed necessarily, that Government must be already prepared with its stores on the spot, which stores it must have already imported from distant lands. As yet, no steps had been taken in that direction. The supplies of these distant lands had apparently not yet been drawn on for the wants of India. "I don't gather that supplies of food are yet coming into the distressed districts from Burma, Madras, or Siam," wrote the Secretary of State on the 15th January, 1897. The reason was natural enough. Prices in those parts had already, owing to demands which India was ordinarily wont to supply, risen much; they left but a narrow margin for the private traders' profit after damage and freight had been paid; and then there were the further risks of the grain not proving popular (a risk which the intimate knowledge of Government officials would go far to obviate), of the means of carriage into remote parts, and a hundred other difficulties which it required a very large possible profit to encourage a private trader to face. The results so far of the present policy on this point had been that, in accordance with the prophecy of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, on the 30th September, prices had been "driven up altogether out of the reach of large numbers of the poorer rayats (cultivators with holdings of their own), agricultural labourers, artisans, and others." They had been thrown on the hands of the Government for relief, others would gradually be swept into the spreading vortex. On the 23rd November he reported "prices phenomenally high, and prices of coarsest and best food grains approximating as they do in famines." Prices had in many parts of the afflicted districts for three months not been more favourable than 16 and 17 lbs. per rupee. These presumably were the official prices of the grain merchants; in the remote parts they would, if that were so, be much higher. The numbers on relief had risen to two millions, showing thus early great and widespread exhaustion among classes who should have stood out much longer. On the 28th October, 1896, the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces wrote: "With exhausted stocks, deficient harvests, and the pressure of a load of debt, which had steadily grown during the succession of unfavourable years, it is not surprising that the feeling of the agricultural population should be one of great despondency, almost of despair, and that the position of the landless classes should cause the gravest anxiety." From Behar, in October, combinations of grain dealers were reported—they withheld supplies for some days. The Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, in November, reported combinations of grain dealers and rising prices. The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, on November 18th, sent a long report to the Government of India, dealing more especially with the condition of Behar. Contrasting it with the Behar of 1874, when there was the famine, he pointed out the enormous spread of railways throughout the province of Behar in the last 20 years (589 miles as against 147), and added: "But though there are many grounds for confidence which did not exist in 1873-74, the fact cannot be overlooked that there are also fresh grounds for anxiety. Prices of food grains have steadily risen during the past two years, and are now higher than they ever have been before; this fact, coupled with the facts already mentioned, that wages have not risen proportionally to prices; that the purchasing power of the

poorer classes has, therefore, been steadily diminishing, and is now less than ever it was; that whereas in former years of scarcity prices were kept down by importation from the North-Western Provinces and lower Bengal, in the present year supplies from these sources cannot be confidently relied upon—are all circumstances that give fresh cause for anxiety, which had no existence in 1873-74." The Lieut.-Governor proceeded to remark that it was estimated that there was a deficit of 550,000 tons of grain in Behar for the year's provision, and while hoping that this estimate might prove exaggerated, he added:—"If private trade does not step in in time to supply the deficit, there may be at any time a panic and a sudden rise in prices. The question whether private trade will do all that is required is in reality the crux of the situation." He pointed out that to relieve the situation the importations must come from beyond the sea (this, two months later, the Secretary of State said, had not been done)—"Because the high prices in Eastern Bengal, and the indications of distress already existing in districts that were always considered free from risks of scarcity show that little reliance can be placed on supplies from within the province of Bengal." He laid great stress on the loophole in the Famine Commissioners' Report:—"A resolution to rely on the ordinary operations of trade to meet the wants of the country unquestionably rests, not only on the activity of traders, but also on the probability of the requisite supplies of food being forthcoming at the critical time." "They admitted," he added, "that there may be cases in which Government interference is admissible, such as for the purpose of providing food required for payment of wages on relief works, and distribution of gratuitous relief stimulating trade when it is sluggish or fails to act, or grain dealers combine and refuse to sell." The conclusion he arrived at was—"That there is ground for confidence that the food wants of the provinces will be met by private trade." These hopes he built on anticipated importations from Burma, importations which, two months later, the Secretary of State pointed out, had not taken place. He adds:—"It is necessary to repeat that, in view of the unparalleled highness of prices and of extent of the area over which there has been shortness of crops throughout India, the situation as regards the food supply is not free, even in Bengal, from elements of doubt and anxiety." These doubts should now have become intensified. It appeared that in parts of three of the Behar districts, Champaran, Mozuffirpore and Darbhanga, communications were still defective. These were generally large exporting districts, and were therefore without any native machinery for import. Exports arranged for beforehand in all probability were in November still going forward there, though it was in these parts the failure had been greatest, and prices were between 16 lbs. and 18 lbs. per rupee. The planters of Mozuffirpore were arranging for importing 1,500 tons of rice from Rangoon for sale on easy terms to their villagers. The Maharaja of Darbhanga was similarly arranging for 5,000 tons for sale on favourable terms to his tenants; but inasmuch as this was being bought locally, it might have had the undesirable effect of shortening supplies in the markets and raising prices. These gentlemen, so intimately acquainted with the wants of the peasantry on their estates, acted thus so far back as November, and they could only have done so from the knowledge that private trade was not, and would not, place grain in the market at possible prices. They knew, as all experience showed, that to store and sell grain to the peasantry at possible prices was the best, and indeed only, way of staving off an almost universal destitution. The Government, who in India was more emphatically than in any other country the one great landlord, still declined to move in this direction. These gentlemen were no more grain dealers than the Government was; but close acquaintance with the necessities of the case compelled them to turn to. Of one district—Khurda, in Lower Bengal—the Lieutenant-Governor, on the 20th November, reported that he had just heard from the Commissioner that relief must be started in one subdivision, that the price of rice in the bazaars was 12 to 14 lbs. per rupee, and that these were merely fancy prices as the grain was not forthcoming in any quantities even at that price: "If the state of things is so bad in Khurda, with its abundant waterways and its proximity to Calcutta, it is only probable that the condition of things in more distant places may be equally bad." As to the chance of private trade doing all that was required, which was to keep prices down, even in the most out-of-the-way parts, to a rate not dearer than 18 lbs.

of common food per rupee, which all experience showed must not be passed, and cannot long be passed, without an uncontrollable calamity, the following are not unimportant considerations. Wheat and rice were probably the main grains in question—rice in the more eastern and southern of the affected districts, wheat in those more to the north-west. The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, with the best information before him, wrote to the Government of India on the 18th November as follows: "Cargoes of Californian wheat of 4,000 to 5,000 each can be landed in Calcutta at Rs. 5 to Rs. 5.1 per maund. Offers for such cargoes to arrive in two months or more are not higher than Rs. 4.10 to Rs. 4.11, a fact which indicates, in the opinion of merchants, the price of wheat will not in Calcutta rise beyond Rs. 4.10 to 4.11 within the next two months." But these were wholesale and not retail prices; the retail price in Calcutta, to admit of any profit at that time, would be quite Rs. 5 per maund, or 16 lbs. per rupee. It appeared from the above that Californian wheat could not be imported at a less cost than Rs. 5 per maund at the seaboard, which would mean quite Rs. 5.8 before reaching the railway stations in the North-West, and Rs. 6 before penetrating into the remote parts. Then a profit had to be made by the retail vendor, and his risks had to be covered, so that Rs. 6½ was probably the price at which private trade could afford to import and retail wheat in the interior of the North-Western Provinces. This would mean about 12 lbs. per rupee. As to rice, the same authority on the same date wrote that the new coarse Baracate rice (which was not much in favour) could be obtained at Rangoon (for delivery in two months or later) at Rs. 3.8 per maund, or Rs. 4.8 at Calcutta. This would mean quite Rs. 5 at any central railway station in Behar, and quite Rs. 6 before the retail vendor in remote parts could hope to secure a profit. That would be about 13½ lbs. per rupee. Thus, so far as he could see, there was no chance, and since November there has been no chance, of private trade being able to import and retail the grain in common use at such a price as was possible for the people, or as could possibly hope to stave off the spread of a calamity which threatened to become almost universal. In this connexion, too, it must be remembered that, as Sir Lepel Griffin pointed out the other day in a letter to the *Times*, the savings of the cultivators of India were being largely invested in the silver ornaments of their women. These formed their savings bank. Hitherto, in all famine times, these had been turned into rupees for the purchase of grain. The price they had fetched in rupees had been the value of the silver. Now things were different. The Government, by closing the mints, had put the rupee 25 per cent. above the value of the silver it contained, and the cultivator now, in order to get four rupees, would have to sell the silver of five. His means of purchasing were thus materially reduced, and the 18 lb. price of which he had spoken as one which previous experience showed could not be materially passed, became now, owing to the above circumstances, all the more emphatically so. The Secretary of State, in his despatch of January 15th to the Viceroy, stated: "I do not gather that supplies of food are yet coming from Burma, Madras, or Siam;" but adds: "I question if Indian prices are as yet high enough to attract wheat or corn maize from the West." Thus, it would seem certain that private trade would not in the present distress move to keep materially by foreign importation of grain except prices for common grain in the interior rose to about 12 or 13 lbs. per rupee. But this was a price which must at all hazards be prevented. It could only be prevented at a loss to the importers; and Government was alone the importer who could afford the loss, and who was bound to incur it.

The EARL OF ORSLOW said he was sorry that he could not give the noble lord any information as to the exact number of relief camps in existence. He could say, however, that each relief work was under a responsible officer, who visited that relief work constantly. The numbers engaged on the relief works varied from 100 or 200 to 28,000 or 30,000, and some of those works were under the charge of the local zemindars, who did most excellent service in a recent famine. The Government had certain statistics as to the mortality of the districts of Jabalpur, and these showed that there was a very large mortality in the early months of the year due mainly, if not entirely, to cholera or fever, and that mortality had been steadily increasing. They had desired the Government of India to supply that information, shortly and roughly as it must necessarily be, from time to time, whenever there was an increase of mortality above the normal. As to measures for

the storage of grain, it was perfectly true that it was the policy of the Government for a short time to import themselves grain into the distressed districts, but the result of that was found to be very unsatisfactory. Very shortly afterwards—in the famine of 1876, towards the close of the year—the Government ceased to import grain into the districts, and the consequence was that as soon as Government competition had disappeared the private traders were encouraged to take up and continue their operations, and no less than 4,000 cwt. a day were poured into the district until the railways were carrying as much as it was possible for them to carry. With the experience which the Government of India had of several famines they had determined to lay down the principle that they would not interfere with private trade so long as private trade was able to supply the necessities of the people. Exceptional cases were recorded in the Blue-book in which it was the duty of the Government, and one which they recognised, to intervene. They recognised that food must be provided at relief works, that trade must be stimulated where it was sluggish by guaranteeing prices or advancing money to traders, and where there was a combination among traders not to sell at normal prices the Government might then intervene, but except in these exceptional cases the Government of India were satisfied that the requirements of the situation could be met, as far as could be seen in the immediate future, by the action of private traders. The noble lord was, no doubt, aware that the Lieutenant-Governors in the different provinces had full power to act in those exceptional cases whenever they arose within their districts. The noble lord had stated that the present famine was of exceptional severity, and that it had spread over a wider area than any previous famine. It was perfectly true, at any rate so far as the extent of the area was concerned; but he thought the noble lord would agree that upon no former occasion had the Government of India been in so favourable a position, owing to the wise foresight of those who laid down the Famine Code, for dealing with so widespread a calamity. He assured the noble lord that, although a new condition of affairs had arisen, inasmuch as the stocks of grain in India were likely to be drawn upon to the fullest possible extent, and it was possible that it might be necessary to import grain from outside, the Secretary of State and the Government of India were giving the most careful attention to the whole subject, and the remarks of the noble lord would not be lost sight of. The Government of India would be the last persons to desire that their lordships should refrain from criticism of their action, but he expressed a hope that in this unexampled and double calamity which had fallen on India the Viceroy and his advisers might have the support of their lordships on both sides of the House. He was satisfied that if they were successful in combating this great evil they would establish a greater claim even than the remembrance of our military prowess or naval supremacy on the loyalty and affection of the people of India. (Hear, hear.)

The EARL OF NORTHBROOK: I am sure my noble friend who introduced this subject was quite justified in doing so, because there can be no doubt of the magnitude of the calamity which affects our Indian Empire, and of the great difficulties with which the Government of India has to contend in meeting it. The question whether it is desirable or otherwise for the Government to interfere with trade for the purchase and storage of grain in affected parts of the country, is perhaps one of the most difficult administrative questions with which any Government has to deal. Speaking generally, the more trade is left untrammelled the greater the probability of meeting the demand for grain, or any other article in any country, and that general principle undoubtedly applies to India. The greater extent of railways, which now exists, makes it far more easy for trade to meet the demand in different parts of India than was the case 23 years ago. At that time it was necessary to import considerable supplies of rice into the northern parts of Bengal. That was done by the Government of the day because, from the best information they could obtain, there was no probability whatever of trade dealing with the difficulty, and the result was satisfactory. It did not interfere with trade in other parts of the country, and the people were supplied with food. But what I wish to say on the present occasion is that I conceive this to be a matter which may be confidently and safely left to the discretion of the Government of India. (Hear, hear.) They have a great, an almost overwhelming, responsibility placed upon their shoulders. It seems to me, having read the Blue-book, that

they have taken every precaution in their power to obtain the fullest information as to the food supplies, and that they are prepared to act with promptitude supposing it becomes necessary to take steps by the Government for the importation of food supplies into any part of the country. I happen to be personally acquainted with the Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal, of the North-West Provinces, and of the Punjab, those districts in which the greatest distress is anticipated, and I can assure your lordships that no three officers in the service of the Crown can be better able to cope with a difficulty of this or of any other description, and I have the most complete confidence that they will act with energy and promptitude. I desire also to express my opinion, as far as I am able to judge, that the full confidence of the people of this country may be placed in Lord Elgin and in those who are assisting him, and I do not think that any action of your lordships is required by the circumstances of the case, or is in any respect desirable. (Cheers.)

Lord WENLOCK said he had only lately returned from a part of India where, he was thankful to say, there was at present very slight distress, yet the noble lord who introduced the subject had raised a question on which he was able to throw a little light. In 1891-92, in the Presidency of Madras, they were threatened with a very serious state of affairs, arising from great scarcity of water, and naturally at that time the Government's attention was drawn most particularly to the question of the supply of grain to the impoverished districts. From all quarters the Government was constantly asked to take up the question itself and deal with it; and the conclusion it arrived at was that any interference with the food trade would be more likely to work harm than good. He often came across cases where "rings" or "corners" were made by the grain merchants, not only to keep up the price of grain, but to hold it back till prices reached a much higher figure, and on every occasion it was found that some private individual, or perhaps a syndicate of philanthropic and charitable persons, merely by sending up a truck or two of grain, was able at once to restore the balance of prices and to keep them steady throughout the whole country. That was by far the soundest course that could be adhered to. He was convinced the Governments of the various provinces were watching those points most narrowly, and if at any time it was found that private trade was not able to meet the requirements of the case, then and then only would the Government step in and do the work which the noble lord wished them to do at once. He mentioned these facts because his experience was a recent one.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I cannot speak at all with the experience of my noble friend Lord Northbrook, or that of the noble lord who has been Governor of Madras; but I merely wish to echo the feeling which Lord Northbrook has expressed—that in this great calamity we must trust to the Government of India to take the necessary measures. (Cheers.) All those who have been connected with the administration of Indian affairs must be aware that there is no subject which has received more close and continuous attention than that dealing with famine, and never has the Government of India been so well prepared as it now is to cope with a calamity of this kind. Not only has a most elaborate code, founded upon experience of former famines, been drawn up, but, what is most material, in the course of the long period during which there has been no serious famine in India, there has been created a number of railways, generally known as famine lines, and by these means, to a great extent, the very serious difficulties which formerly existed in the way of carrying food to the people, because of there being no means of transport, have been overcome. I am sanguine that everything will be done that can possibly be done, although from the very magnitude of the calamity it will be impossible to prevent much privation and terrible suffering. I greatly lament that so great a calamity should be accompanied also with a threatened extension of the bubonic plague which has broken out in Bombay. If that plague should, unhappily, extend itself into the country, then indeed it will require all the energies which can possibly be displayed by the Government of India to cope with it. With regard to the statistics promised by the noble lord, I do hope that in a crisis of this kind the not too numerous civil servants of the Government in India will not be vexed by being obliged to spend their time in making too elaborate returns. (Hear, hear.) Perhaps one of the greatest curses of the administration of India is the enormous amount of paper work now imposed

upon the servants of the Government—(Hear, hear)—and in a visitation of this kind, when every man will be assigned to his utmost capacity and energy in connection with the relief works, I hope they may be allowed to pursue the more urgent work of looking after the distress and not be required to furnish too elaborate statistics of what is going on until after the calamity has been overcome. (Cheers.)

The EARL OF ORKNEY: That has not been lost sight of by the Secretary of State. All that has been asked for is a rough calculation; and returns such as can be prepared from the local registers of deaths will suffice for the purpose, provided the information is prompt and is telegraphed.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I do not make the least complaint; but what I meant to deprecate was the pressure upon the Government which may come hereafter for more and more information. (Hear, hear.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE "WARREN HASTINGS."

Mr. VICARY GIBBS asked the Under-Secretary of State for War what was the cause of the disaster to the *Warren Hastings* on or about the 13th January, when carrying troops to the Mauritius; and whether compensation would be paid to the regiment, or to individual members of it, for loss of property.

Mr. BRODRICK: It is not yet known what was the cause of the wreck of the *Warren Hastings*. A full enquiry will no doubt take place. The allowance regulations provide for compensation within certain limits to all officers and men losing property under such circumstances, and any claims submitted to the War Office will be duly considered.

February 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Opium)—Return presented, showing for the last ten years the acreage under poppy in India; the amount of advances to the cultivators for crude opium; and the quantity of opium produced in the factories, distinguishing between the Behar and Benares agencies:

Also the quantity exported to China and other countries; the quantity of Malwa and other opium purchased by the Indian Government; and the quantity which in any other way came under the cognizance of the Indian Government. (Address, Thursday, 28th January; Mr. H. J. Wilson); to lie upon the table.

THE CHITRAL MEDAL.

Mr. BROOKFIELD asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he was aware that considerable disappointment prevailed at the delay in issuing a medal for the Chitral campaign:

Whether he could explain the cause of this delay:

And, whether the Secretary of State for War would make some representation in the proper quarter with a view to hastening the issue of this medal.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I greatly regret any disappointment caused by the delay in issuing the Chitral medal. The delay is practically due to a proposal from the Government of India that, in the place of a clasp being added to the existing frontier medal, an altogether new medal should be struck and issued to note the services of this very successful expedition. This involved the selection and execution of a design—a necessarily lengthy process. The dies were sent to India on the 1st of January, and I presume the medals are now being struck.

THE TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India if there was any truth in the rumour of scurvy having been prevalent among the Indian troops at Suakin and Tokar last year.

Lord GEO. HAMILTON: The Indian troops at Suakin were attacked for a short time by a sudden outbreak of scurvy during which two British officers, 108 men, and 85 followers

were admitted to hospital suffering from this complaint. In about a month—viz., by the beginning of November—it was completely eradicated, and the General-Officer-Commanding was able to report that “by the middle of November, as far as the men were concerned, the force was as fit to take the field as it was on its arrival in the country.”

CADETSHIPS IN THE INDIAN ARMY.

Sir SEYMOUR KINE asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether he had received a sworn declaration made by Colonel A. C. Turner, Colonel C. H. Spragge, Colonel J. F. Beough, and Colonel A. N. Pearse, all of the Royal Artillery, with reference to the circumstances under which sixteen successful candidates who had competed for cadetships in Addiscombe College, in December, 1869, with a view of obtaining commissions in the Indian Artillery and Engineers, were in December, 1860, induced to accept commissions in Her Majesty's Royal Artillery or Engineers, the Government having, while these cadets were pursuing their course for the Indian Army at Addiscombe, decided not to make any more appointments to the Indian Artillery and Engineers; whether these officers had passed the examination prescribed by the regulations for the admission of candidates for cadetships in the Engineers and Artillery of Her Majesty's Indian forces, under the 84th clause of the Act of 21 and 22 Vic., cap. 106, and been sworn in as Indian cadets, and on their part had duly fulfilled the terms and conditions of the regulations; whether his attention had been particularly drawn to the statement in the declaration that early in December, 1860, the sixteen cadets, of whom these officers were the survivors, were asked by Sir Frederick Abbott, the Governor of Addiscombe, if, as no more appointments were to be made for India, they would accept commissions in Her Majesty's Royal Artillery or Engineers, and were assured that the privileges that would have belonged to them if appointed would be guaranteed that £100 each was subsequently paid them towards their expenses at Addiscombe by the Indian Government, in accordance with one of the conditions under which they had received their cadetships; also that, on joining at Woolwich at Addiscombe early in 1861, ten of the candidates, including the declarants, who obtained commissions in Her Majesty's Royal Artillery, were assured by Colonel G. Kennedy, then in command of the depot, that if they would consent to volunteer for general service their privileges under the conditions in the regulations for admission to cadetships at Addiscombe would be preserved to them; would he explain why, in spite of these declarations, they had been retired on pension at English instead of Indian rates, and had been deprived of the benefit which would have accrued to them, had they been appointed to the Indian Army, of counting the year they spent at Addiscombe towards pension; and whether as these cadets were induced to continue their course and accept appointments in Her Majesty's Artillery by assurances officially given to them by two superior officers representing the Crown, the Government now intended to repudiate these assurances.

Mr. BRONSON: I can add very little to the replies made to my hon. friend in 1895 by the right hon. gentleman the member for the Stirling District. The salient point in this case is that those officers never were in the Indian Army, appointments to which had ceased before they came out of Addiscombe. Whatever hopes, if any, were held out by the Governor of that college, were certainly unauthorised; and they were set aside in advance by the Indian General Order of the 9th December, 1859, intimating that “all future appointments of cadets should be made subject to any alteration that may be decided upon.”

February 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India, what had been the amount expended from the revenues of India on the Indian troops sent to Suakin.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The expedition of Indian troops to Suakin did not throw any charge upon Indian revenues, but it did not relieve Indian revenues of the ordinary pay and allowances of the troops so sent.

The ordinary pay and allowances for six months of the troops despatched is estimated to be about £40,000 for the period during which they were stationed at Suakin, but have not received the full amounts.

The extraordinary expenditure defrayed from the Treasury Chest of the Imperial Government is about £145,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked if the noble lord's estimate of £5,000 had been exceeded?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I think it is very nearly accurate. I estimated about £5,000 a month, and the troops were there 7½ months.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Under Secretary of State for War, whether he would state the items of charge for which the Supplementary Estimate was asked for the expenses of the Indian troops at Suakin?

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: The details have not been received. The proposed Vote is based upon an estimate of the extra expense incurred by the Indian Government, and is framed by it.

February 5th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

PETITION AGAINST THE CHARGES.

Expenses of Indian Troops in Africa—Petition from Pandharpur, against imposition on the revenues of India; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

ORGANISED PERSECUTION AND MOB-LAW.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he would state the circumstances under which prolonged quarantine was imposed at Durban on the steamships “Courland” and “Naderi,” which recently arrived from Bombay with clean bills of health; whether he was aware that the agents of the steamers protested against such quarantine as illegal, that a riotous demonstration took place to induce certain passengers to return to India, and that these passengers when landing were attacked and threatened with lynching; and whether he would state what steps had been taken to prevent the recurrence of such incidents?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The “Courland” and “Naderi” having arrived at Durban from Bombay, a port infected with plague, were placed in quarantine, and I have no reason to believe that there was any irregularity in the manner in which the quarantine law was enforced. I am not aware whether the ship's agent protested against the quarantine. Upon the arrival of these ships considerable excitement existed at Durban, and meetings were held to protest against the passengers by these ships being allowed to land and to organise a demonstration to prevent their landing. On the day when the ships came into harbour about 5,000 persons assembled and threatened to forcibly prevent the landing, but the authorities induced them to disperse and the landing took place without opposition, except in the case of one person, who was assaulted but not seriously hurt. This incident did not take place at the ordinary landing-place. I have no reason to doubt that the Natal Government will take all possible precautions to prevent any violation of the law should any other ships arrive from Bombay.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked the right hon. gentleman whether he could assure the House that there was no reason to think that the responsible authorities of Natal had in any way countenanced the popular movement against the Indian immigrants, and that they would make it clear that the Indian immigrants were entitled to protection like any others of her Majesty's subjects?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think that is really a proper question to put. The hon. member is catechising me with regard to the intentions and motives of the Government of a self-governing colony. I have no doubt the Natal Government will do all it ought to do; at the same time, I am not responsible for them. (“Hear, hear.”)

QUARANTINE ORDERS.

Sir WALTER FOSTER asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention had been called to two telegrams, (1) from Gibraltar to the effect that vessels from India would not get pratique there, and would not be allowed to land passengers or goods. Mails and specie would be landed in quarantine, and coals and provisions supplied in quarantine; and (2) from Malta that from 6th February inclusive, vessels from India, having no cases of plague or suspected cases of plague on board, would communicate with Comino Island, where passengers could be landed to undergo 21 days quarantine, their clothes and linen being disinfected. Such vessels would call at Comingott's Islet; and, whether he would communicate with these Crown Colonies with a view to the adoption of more scientific and more convenient measures for the protection of public health, and also with the view to prevent an example being set by the Crown Colonies to Foreign Governments, calculated to encourage the imposition of restrictions on British commerce?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN. My attention has been called to the quarantine orders in Gibraltar and Malta referred to in the Question. The Governor of Gibraltar informs me that the stringent regulation adopted there is necessary to prevent quarantine being enforced by Spain against Gibraltar, which would put a stop to the Admiralty work on the harbour. As regards Malta I may refer the hon. member to my answer to his Question on January 26th. I am glad to say that the Colonial Government have to some extent relaxed the stringency of the measures at first adopted, and I trust that, although they are placed in a position of some difficulty by the very strong feeling of the inhabitants of all classes in favour of the antiquated system of strict quarantine, they may be induced by degrees to adopt more enlightened methods of protecting the public health.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

* ARE THERE ANY DEATHS?

RETICENCE OF THE INDIA OFFICE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state the number of deaths from famine officially recorded during the last great famine; whether he would explain according to what test a death was then recorded as caused by famine, judged by the same test, had been reported to him during the present famine; and whether he would each week lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the number of such deaths, if any, in each province?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The estimated abnormal mortality and loss of population (including decrease of births) caused by the famine in 1877-78 was calculated by the Famine Commission to be about 6,850,000. I need not remind the House that any estimate of this kind must necessarily be regarded as approximate only. This particular estimate was arrived at partly by test censuses in typical areas, and partly by a comparison of the number of births and deaths which occurred in given areas during the famine with the normal number of births and deaths for the same areas and for similar periods. The Government of India have been asked to furnish periodical reports of any abnormal mortality which may occur in any part of the present famine area. These reports will be included in the further papers which I propose to lay on the table, at intervals of six weeks so long as the famine lasts. I am afraid that it is impossible for me to undertake more than this.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

ARMY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1896-7.

On the Vote of £145,000, Pay, etc., of Indian Troops at Suakin.

Mr. LOUGH asked whether this vote covered the whole cost of the troops? He thought that the Indian Government ought not to be put to any expense at the present time.

Mr. T. R. BUCHANAN said that there were points on which information was desirable. In the past there had constantly been difficulties in settling the accounts as between India and the Home Government. Sometimes the Indian Government had had to wait months and years, and in connection with the

Abyssinian campaign the money due from the Imperial Exchequer had to be borrowed. Did this sum of £145,000 represent the general Estimate of the Indian Government? What were the details of the amount, and was it a final discharge, leaving no claims in dispute?

Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS said that yesterday he had informed the hon. gentleman that the estimate of the total extra cost falling upon India through the use of the troops at Suakin had been framed in India, and, in the opinion of the Indian Government, covered every charge. Since yesterday he had received further information. The estimate was divided into seven heads, each of which had been computed by the Indian Government. The heaviest item was £59,000 for the transport of the troops from India and back. There was also £35,000 for land transit, £35,000 for commissariat, and the balance was made up of such items as pay, medical service and ordnance. Her Majesty's Government had every assurance that the total sum would cover every expense to which the Indian Government had been put.

Mr. LABOUCHÈRE said that there were many members who, like himself, desired to divide against this vote as a protest against the employment of Indian troops at all outside India, and more especially in the Sudan, but they were unable to do so, because, if the Vote were rejected, the cost would be thrown on the people of India. (Hear, hear.) As a matter of fact, however, a considerable burden would have to be borne by India, owing to this expedition. It seemed to him a monstrous thing at a time like the present, when the people of India were struggling with famine for their lives, to tax them in order to carry out a ridiculous, absurd, and iniquitous policy of jingoism in Africa. (Cheers.) He also thought the Committee should be informed what services the Indian troops had done while at Suakin, and whether India or anybody else had benefitted to the extent not of £140,000, but of 140,000 pence, by this sending of Indian troops, despite the protest of the Indian Government, to occupy Suakin. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. DILLON said that when this question was discussed last year, public opinion was overwhelmingly in favour of the Imperial Government providing the pay of the Indian troops while away from India. He therefore thought that as India was suffering from a terrible famine, the Government ought to depart from the selfish and utterly indefensible principle of refusing to pay the wages of the Indian troops they had brought to Suakin. He regretted the forms of the House did not allow him to move an increase of the vote by £40,000, or whatever might be the amount of the pay of the troops; and he thought the Government would do well to put down an estimate for refunding the money to India as a contribution to the famine fund.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said he appreciated the spirit of the remarks of the hon. member for East Mayo; but they were open to the grave objection that they mixed up two questions that ought to be kept apart. If help from us was required by India, because of the terrific famine, the aid that would be given would be very much larger than £30,000. (Hear, hear.) On the other hand, to remit this charge upon India would be to neglect a very important fiscal question of policy between the two countries in regard to the employment of Indian troops in similar cases in the future. (Hear, hear.) While, therefore, he had every desire to consider any application for aid from India—should it be made—he trusted that the suggestion which had been made would not be proceeded with on that occasion.

February 8th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

CONDITION OF THE AFFECTED PROVINCES.
OFFICIAL RETICENCE AS TO MORTALITY.

LORD KINNAIRD asked the following questions, of which he had given private notice to the Government: Whether Her Majesty's Government were in a position to affirm or contradict the statement telegraphed on the 2nd inst. by Reuter's agent from Raipur in the Central Provinces, that many deaths from starvation had already taken place, that many persons were on the brink of starvation, and that the district, with a population

of one and a-half millions, was almost without food supplies. In the worst districts of each of the affected provinces, what was now the selling price of grain in common use, (a) in the towns, (b) in the remote interior? What did Her Majesty's Government consider to be the retail selling price of such grain which could not be passed without the speedy exhaustion of the cultivating and artisan classes, by which is meant classes above the unskilled wage-earning labourer? He said that the statement of the Secretary of State in another place on Friday last reminded the country of an awful possibility. If the loss of life was estimated at 5,800,000 in 1877-8, out of a population of 27,000,000, what was the possibility of this famine, affecting an area with a population of 40,000,000? If the same ratio of lives were lost the number would reach the appalling total of over eight millions. He had carefully read over the Government's answer to the questions he addressed to them last Monday, and he considered they wholly failed to answer the facts and figures which he ventured to put forward, as he believed, making out a case that the time had arrived when they must on a large scale store grain, and, if necessary, import it from Burma and elsewhere. They were not working in the dark, without precedent to guide them. Of the principal famines of this century only one was successfully grappled with, and that was by Lord Northbrook and Sir Richard Temple, and the other officers working under them, and they were only able to avert horrible destruction of human life by a large importation of grain. The crux of the whole matter was, would private trade do what was necessary? Would it supply grain to even get-at-able districts at a possible price? This necessary help must, as the Lieut.-Governor of Bengal had said, come by grain imported from across the sea. The optimistic prophecies and promises of the Government that they would prevent loss of life had already been falsified. He believed it was now admitted that the situation in the Central Provinces was serious. Reuter's Agency telegraphed the serious news that an area of 12,000 miles and a population of 1,500,000 was almost without food supply. In a week or two they would hear whether a sufficient stock of grain would be brought in by private traders. He was introduced to a gentleman that day who had been 38 years in India, 32 of which were spent in the Government service. He left Bombay on December 14, and he admitted that planters, merchants, importers, and others who knew the country well, estimated that up to November 14, there had been 250,000 deaths from starvation. In the Central Provinces there was another burning question, the supply of seed grain, which neither landlords nor tenants were able to get. Did the Government intend to provide seed for the next harvest under the Famine Code? Papers dated January 13 from Calcutta gave an account of a meeting of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce. The Committee of that body said:—"Having regard to the widespread effect of the present scarcity, the committee had been impressed by the high range of prices throughout the Province of Bengal. Even in places where the crop has not wholly failed, prices of food stuffs are far in excess of anything marking the beginning of scarcity in 1874 or in 1866. This high range of wholesale prices means a very considerably higher retail price to the people, so that the effect of the demand for food in the afflicted tracts, and in the tracts where the crops have notoriously failed, has led the committee to infer that stocks throughout the country are low." The British Indian Association, which always spoke with authority, had also expressed dissatisfaction that steps had not been taken to secure an adequate store of grain which could be utilised at short notice. This, they believed, could only be done by the Government, so that, in the event of a crisis, it might be used in outlying districts. With reference to questions 2 and 3, he ventured to think an assurance was required from the Government that, whenever the rate rose to 18 lb. per rupee, direct orders should be given that imported grain would be brought into the district; for it was an established fact in famine history, that it was impossible for the rate to be 18 lb. per rupee of grain in common use for long without the death of millions, as in Orissa and Southern Indian. Private trade was sure to be busy about and in seaports and the main lines of railway, and might possibly do all that was wanted there. It did so in Behar, sending into the distressed parts 50,000 tons a month. This fact showed how futile all the assertions were that the Government by their importing so largely—altogether about 500,000 tons—crushed out of activity private

trade. It imported again in Southern India, when it threw into the distressed parts of Madras and Bombay 100,000 tons a month; but the grain never got into the remote parts. The prices prevailing along the line of rail were high enough to enable traders to make a profit, and all they could bring was greedily absorbed on the main line. They had no mind to face the difficulties and risks of the further journey into the remote parts. This was no conjecture, for he had seen private letters from the Central Provinces which arrived last week, speaking of terrible scenes and deaths from starvation. He had received a letter speaking of a district some miles from a town or railway, in which the distress was very acute throughout the villages. At present there were no relief works, and no possibility of getting Government assistance. The action of the Government in discouraging private charity had made it difficult to collect funds, and the Mansion House Fund was entirely in the hands of the Government. The difficulty was that the Government either had no information or thought it well to follow the advice of the Leader of the Opposition, that the Indian Government should have a free hand and not be interfered with or troubled with questions. He was not making any complaints of the self-denying hard work of many officials. He only hoped that many would not give way under the strain; as one noble worker had done—a Deputy Commissioner who died of brain fever from the strain put on him by the famine, constantly saying, "These people are dying and I cannot save them." What the country would require of the Government was, not assurances and promises, but facts justifying the statements put forward, that the Government of India was never in so favourable a position for combating famine. Many high authorities took the opposite view, for prices had been for some years at an exhausting figure, and now the scarcity and increased dearth were more widespread than ever had been the case before. Stocks were not coming forward as expected, and the landlords and people with wealth were clinging to their supplies.

The EARL OF ONSLOW: The noble lord has not confined himself to asking questions, but has given your lordships a certain amount of information, and has passed some criticism on the action of the Viceroy and his Government, and perhaps your lordships will forgive me if, before I address myself to answering the questions of the noble lord, I deal for a moment with what he has said. In the first place, I am not aware that the Government of Lord Elgin has at any time made any promise or statement that the Government would be able to prevent entirely loss of life. I think the statement made was that the Government had recognised that it should be in such a position that no persons, need of necessity lose their lives; and I would point out that there is a considerable difference between the two propositions. The noble lord has said that he has been informed that in one particular district there have been 250,000 deaths from famine. I am not in a position to contradict the assertion made by the noble lord, but I can say this—that if it should hereafter prove to be corroborated and shown to be correct, I should be very much surprised, because it is quite in opposition to all the information we have received; and when the noble lord asks me whether Her Majesty's Government can affirm or contradict what has been reported by Reuter's agent at Raipur, I can only assure him that it is quite contrary to the information we have received. I am not myself in a position to say what the number of deaths at Raipur may have been, but the Secretary of State has communicated with the Government of India by telegraph, and I shall be glad to hand to my noble friend a copy of the reply as soon as it is received. The noble lord has asked me a number of other questions, some of which it is not easy to answer in a general way. The noble lord asks me what Her Majesty's Government consider to be the retail selling price of grain which cannot be passed without the speedy exhaustion of the cultivator and artisan classes, by which is meant classes above the unskilled wage-earning labourer. If the noble lord will refer to the Report of the Famine Commissioners he will see that the actual price of grain in a particular district is not really controlled by the necessities of the population but by the power of the population to purchase. The Commissioners say that it is a well-ascertained fact that prices which will be regarded as indicating a state of famine in one part of the country are quite compatible with a state of undisturbed prosperity in another. As to what are the prices now obtaining in different parts of India, I can only answer that by referring to the prices in the particular district to which the noble lord has

referred. On December 31, 1896, rice and wheat were obtainable in Raipur at the rate of 10 seers per rupee, while on the same date in 1893, before famine prices existed, rice was obtainable at the rate of 16 seers per rupee, and wheat at the rate of 16½ seers per rupee; so that the noble lord will see that the price has risen from 16 seers to the rupee to 10. Before I sit down I should like to read part of a telegram received from the Viceroy to-day, which, I think, will go a long way to allay the apprehensions of the noble lord as to the supplies being insufficient for the wants of India to-day. The Viceroy says: "Our latest information is generally reassuring. Steady prices generally, and fall which has now begun in Punjab and N.-W. Provinces, and sufficiency of visible supplies for daily requirements, are favourable indications. Punjab prices reported 15 to 20 per cent. lower than two months ago. Apprehension of failure of stocks would be indicated by rise of prices. Spring crops promise well in Northern India and Hindustan, and ought to add considerably to existing stocks. Sufficiency of existing stocks for all probable emergencies not capable of precise quantitative answer, but no reason to doubt correctness of policy affirmed in your despatch No. 10 of June 15, that trade as a whole can supply food demand better and more effectively than Government." I think that in that answer I shall have given the noble lord some assurance that the Government of India are satisfied that the policy they have adopted, and intend to carry out, is one which will meet the necessities of the situation.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

Misra, W. S.,—Petition of W. S. Misra, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

Mustafabad Jehail Station, —Petition from Mustafabad, against removal; to lie upon the Table.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

THE DEATH-RATE IN THE CENTRAL PROVINCES.

Mr. DAVITT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state from the statistics of the *Local Government Gazette* of the Central Provinces of India, the death rate in those provinces for the six months of the year ending 31st December, 1895, and for the year ending 31st December, 1896, and the total number of deaths in each of these two periods, giving each number separately?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The *Central Provinces Gazette* does not give the full monthly vital statistics for any month later than September, 1896, but the figures for the periods of three months ending September, 1895, and September, 1896, respectively are as follows:—Mean of monthly death rates, July to September, 1895, 43·12 per mille; mean of monthly death rates July to September, 1896, 55·80 per mille; total number of deaths, July to September, 1895, 102,420; total number of deaths, July to September, 1896, 132,552. These provinces were visited by a severe epidemic of cholera in the spring and summer which caused a heavy and general rise in the number of deaths in the summer and early autumn. Though I have no complete summary of the death rate of the whole province for the later months, the Chief Commissioner informed me some time back that in the division of Jabalpur, where the distress was acute, there was a continuous fall in the mortality during October and November.

February 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Sir SARMOUR KIRK asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had been informed that more than two hundred memorials from officers of the Indian Staff Corps had been forwarded in the regular way to the Commander-in-Chief in India, praying for a re-opening and re-consideration of the question of supersession of Staff Corps officers by juniors in the British Army in India; whether the Commander-in-Chief had forwarded their memorials to the Government of India; and whether the Viceroyal authorities had made any representations on the subject to the Secretary of State.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no information as to the submission of any memorials by officers of the Indian Staff Corps regarding their supersession by officers of the British Army in India, nor have I received any representation on the subject from the Government of India.

INDIAN WOOLLEN IMPORTS.

Mr. GOSNOL asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether her Majesty's Government was aware that woollen manufactured articles were being imported into this country from the plague-stricken districts of India; and whether, looking to the general consensus of opinion that the great plague of London derived its origin from woollen manufactures brought into this country from infected countries in Asia Minor and the East, her Majesty's Government would take immediate steps to compel all wools and woollen manufactures coming from India to be thoroughly disinfected before they were allowed to be landed.

Mr. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. friend, all I have to state is that my noble friend, the Secretary of State for India, is in communication with the Indian Government on this subject, and the Indian Government are thoroughly alive to the responsibility which rests upon them. I am sure that every precaution will be taken, and I trust that nothing will be either said or done in this country which may unnecessarily hamper the course of trade.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA. UNCOINED SILVER.

Mr. BROWNAGGER asked the Secretary of State for India whether the estimate which had been published of 1,312,500,000 ounces, as the silver savings of the inhabitants of India, was approximately correct:

Whether he was aware that in former famines such savings were usually exchangeable into rupees weight for weight, but now they had been depreciated about 700,000,000 rupees, or equal to £44,000,000 sterling, owing to the mints being no longer open for the coinage of silver, apart from any further deduction by the Native dealers to cover their risk of the market:

And, whether the Government had any scheme in view to remedy the loss to the people in their distress.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I cannot undertake to give any opinion as to the value of the estimate to which the hon. member refers, or as to the total amount of the depreciation, in relation to rupees, of the uncoined silver held by natives of India. But, as I have already pointed out in reply to a question in this House, although there is now a greater divergence than formerly between the gold value of coined and uncoined silver in India, it does not follow that the purchasing power of silver bullion in that country has fallen.

The Government of India are sparing neither effort nor expenditure to assist the people in their distress, but such assistance will not be based upon the considerations mentioned in the hon. member's question.

INDIAN MUTINY VETERANS.

Sir JOHN LING asked the Under Secretary of State for War what number of compassionate pensions had been granted during the last three years to men who served in the Orissem and Indian Mutiny campaigns; how many men in receipt of such pensions had died during the same period; and what changes, if any, had been made during the last twelve months in the regulations under which these compassionate pensions were granted?

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: During the last three years 1,430 special campaign pensions have been granted, and 279 have lapsed by death. The conditions of grant have been altered during the last year, by including in the minimum of qualifying service a portion of that given under age and of that forfeited.

February 11th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would enquire from the Government of India

why the reply had been sent to a memorial, dated 29th November, 1894, from Mr. E. E. Jardine, Deputy Postmaster of Bombay, regarding his claim to exchange compensation:

And, whether he was aware that Mr. Jardine, on the ground of his English domicile, drew compensation up to 30th November, 1894; that the compensation was then stopped without any reason being assigned; that Mr. Jardine's father possessed an English domicile, as holding her Majesty's commission; and that his brother, M. A. J. A. Jardine, District Police Superintendent in Burma, and Mr. W. F. Jardine, Assistant Collector of Salt in Bombay, whose status was exactly the same as his, were allowed, without objection, to draw their compensation allowance.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The subject of the grant of exchange compensation is, as stated by me on the 26th January, now under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council. Until the Government of India receives his decision, which I hope will be communicated very soon, on the many points that have been raised, they are not in a position to reply to individual memorials.

THE DESAI OF JALIHAI.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the additional evidence adduced in the appeal of the Desai of Jalihal, in the Bombay Presidency, including as it did the original title-deeds and accounts of the Peishwa, had induced the Government to alter their original decision of resuming the estate:

And whether he would lay all the papers upon the table of the House.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of Bombay, having considered the evidence to which the honourable member refers, reported to me that they saw no reason why the previous decisions should be reversed. In this opinion, after considering the memorial which they forwarded, I concurred. If the honourable member wishes to move for the papers, I shall not oppose the motion.

AGRICULTURAL BANKS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in the year 1884 the Viceroy in Council submitted to the India Office a proposal for the establishment of an agricultural bank near Poona, as an effective means of relieving the heavily indebted rayats, which proposal received the hearty support of both rayats and money-lenders; that the Bombay Government was willing to conduct the experiment; that the Manchester Chamber of Commerce memorialised the Secretary of State in its favour, but that the Secretary of State, after long delay, ultimately withhold his sanction:

And, whether he would state for what reasons and upon what expert advice he refused to permit an experiment, unanimously recommended by the Government of India, as being advocated on purely disinterested grounds, and as likely to be of incalculable benefit to the whole country.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I am aware of the discussions to which the question draws attention. The reasons which induced the then Secretary of State to withhold sanction from the scheme to which the honourable member refers are stated at length at pages 55-58 of papers presented to Parliament on the subject in 1887.

When the Poona scheme was negatived, the Government of India were invited to bring forward a revised scheme that would not be open to the same objection. A valuable report on agricultural banks of the world, with suggestions for action in India, has recently been prepared by an officer of the Madras Government. I am in hopes that a practical scheme for making a beginning with such banks may before long be brought forward. The question how best to mitigate and prevent the indebtedness of the Indian peasantry is one of the most important that the governments in India could, in ordinary times possibly consider.

DEATHS FROM FAMINE.

DELAY OF OFFICIAL FIGURES.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would request the Viceroy, in his usual

weekly telegram stating the number of persons on whom it is to include the number of deaths due to the famine in each of the affected districts:

And, whether he had ascertained by telegram the number of deaths due to famine in the Central Provinces.

Lord G. HAMILTON: As I informed the hon. member on the 5th instant, it is not possible to associate with the telegrams describing the weekly progress of relief operations and the numbers receiving relief any statistics relating to mortality for the same period. An interval of time must elapse between the period to which vital statistics in India refer and their receipt in this country. In a despatch (see page 175 of the Blue-book on Famine) I anticipated the hon. member's request by asking for "the earliest possible information of any considerable rise of the death-rate above normal, and also a periodical report of continued mortality of an unusually high rate in any province." I have also requested the Government of India to let me know the total number of deaths from all causes in the Central Provinces in 1896, as soon as the statistics are available.

THE INDIAN MAIL SERVICE.

Sir JOHN LING asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether the contract for the conveyance of the mails to India, China, and Australia had now been arranged; and, if so, what rates of speed had been fixed, and what saving in time could be effected to Bombay, Hong Kong, and Melbourne?

Mr. R. W. HANBURY: The tenders which have been accepted contemplate a speed of 14½ knots on the line to and from India, 18½ knots on the line to and from China, and 14 knots on the line to and from Australia. The time-table has not yet been settled, but it is anticipated that under the new contract, as compared with the old, the following will be the approximate saving in the time of transit of the mails from London: to Bombay, nearly two days; to Hong Kong, four days; to Melbourne, four days.

February 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Statement of Trade)—Copy presented—of Tables relating to the Trade of British India with British Possessions and Foreign Countries for the five years 1891-2 to 1895-6 [by Command], to lie upon the Table.

February 13th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE PLAGUE IN INDIA.

EXPERIMENTS IN INOCULATION.

Lord REAY asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether any recent information had been obtained from the Bombay Government with reference to protective inoculation against bubonic fever; and whether any retired members of the Indian Civil Service were to be temporarily employed in India. He stated that he had followed with some anxiety the development of affairs in the Bombay Presidency, with the Government of which he had himself been so recently connected. He had watched with pleasure the admirable way in which Lord Sandhurst, by personal exertion and in other ways, had dealt with the two-fold calamity which had befallen the Presidency. On January 18 Professor Haffkine, who had been employed on bacteriological research in Bombay, announced that he had found a prophylactic lymph of vaccine, with which he made, first of all, an experiment on himself, and which he believed had since been made on others. Since then Lord Lister, on January 20th, at Belfast, called attention to the importance of the anti-toxin serum which had been discovered by Dr. Yersin in the Pasteur Institute. After Lord Lister made his speech on January 20th, M. Roux, a man of European reputation in this matter and one of the most eminent disciples of Pasteur, and well known through his research with reference to diphtheric serum in the Academy

of Medicine in Paris, gave some most interesting details with reference to the discovery of Dr. Yersin. In 1894 Dr. Yersin was sent by the French Minister for the Colonies to Hong Kong, where this disease prevailed at the time, and he there found, along with a Japanese gentleman, the microbe. Further experiments were thereupon made at the Pasteur Institute, which led to the discovery of the serum, which like the diphtheric serum, was taken from the horse. This serum was not only a prophylactic, but it also had curative properties. Experiments had been made on animals, from which it was clear that its protective properties were probably greater than the curative results which were obtained by it. The next step taken by the French Government was to establish a Pasteur Institute at Nha-trang, in Anam. When the disease broke out again at Hong Kong in January 1896, the Institute was not yet sufficiently advanced to prepare the serum; but on June 10th, Dr. Yersin proceeded to Hong Kong with a few bottles of it, to which were added eighty bottles sent from the Paris Institute. The disease was then dying out at Hong Kong. Dr. Yersin then left for Canton, and there the first experiment was made with the serum. A startling result was obtained. A young Chinese, aged 18, who was inoculated on the 26th had recovered the next day at six o'clock. Dr. Yersin went on to Amoy on July 1st, but he left behind him other cases for treatment, and they also were attended with complete recovery. At Amoy Dr. Yersin treated twenty-three patients. In the course of ten days only two died out of the twenty-three patients, and those two fatal cases were partly due to the fact that the patients were not treated in the first stages of the disease; but two others, who had been ill for five days, recovered. Taking the three patients at Canton and the twenty-five at Amoy, with two deaths on the twenty-eight cases treated, a mortality was obtained of 7.6 per cent., instead of 80 per cent., which was the normal death-rate of the disease fixed by M. Roux. Those facts were certainly worthy of consideration, and he hoped that no effort would be spared to obtain the serum, either from the Pasteur Institute or from Nha-trang. He saw that the matter had not escaped the notice of the Bombay Government, because in a letter from the municipal commissioner to the standing committee of the municipality a hope was expressed that he would be in possession of the serum this month—or rather that Dr. Yersin would be able to forward it this month. Perhaps the noble lord could give some information. With regard to the same question, any one who knew the zeal and the devotion to duty of the Indian Civil Service would agree that there was very considerable risk that they might overwork themselves, and, at all events, in certain districts where there was great pressure by reason of the relief works it might be very desirable to give some additional strength to the establishments. Among retired Indian officials, there were those who had declared themselves ready at any time to go and assist their brethren in India, and he trusted that no hesitation would be felt by the Government on this side, if an appeal came from India, to mobilise those reserve forces which certainly under the exceptional circumstances which now prevailed might be used effectually and without in any way dislocating existing arrangements.

The EARL OF ONSLOW, in reply, said the experiments referred to had not escaped the attention of the Government in Bombay, and M. Yersin had been commissioned by that Government to procure serum for use in Bombay, and he was expected to return to the city about the end of the month or the beginning of next provided with a sufficient quantity of it. The prophylactic vaccine which Professor Haffkine had discovered, although it had not yet been tried for the curative properties of the serum, was likely to prove extremely valuable also. He learnt that on January 2nd Professor Haffkine wrote that 21 animals had been immunised and that he was looking forward to making trial of the new process. He also asked that 49 horses should be purchased to provide a further supply of serum—a request which the municipal commissioner at once took steps to carry out. With reference to the experiments conducted up to the present time the India Office were informed that 612 inoculations in all had taken place, and that no attacks were reported except two in the gaol, and, speaking generally, the Government of Bombay considered the inoculation appeared to afford considerable protection, but sufficient time had not yet elapsed to estimate the degree of protection or how long it would continue. With regard to the second

Question no retired Indian Civil servants had as yet been sent out to India, but the India Office would be prepared to receive the names of any who were willing to volunteer for this service. It did not rest with the India Office to determine whether or not they should be sent out, but their names should be telegraphed to the Viceroy, and if in the exercise of his discretion he thought their services could be made available no doubt he would act accordingly. The energy and activity which had been exhibited by Lord Sandhurst and the members of the Government of Bombay in combating both the plague and the famine were warmly appreciated by Her Majesty's Government. (Cheers.) It might interest the House to hear the contents of a telegram which had just been put into his hands and which gave the latest information concerning the progress of the plague: "Deaths from all causes in Bombay city for week ended February 12th, 1,835. Reported plague deaths, 813. Plague has been to some extent checked where first prevalent. Mandvi now almost free from disease. In Bombay city general tendency to extend north continues. House-to-house visitation active; 218 dwellings condemned as uninhabitable; 31 recommended for alterations; tiles removed from 3,141; earth floors dug up in 581 and 2,277 limewashed; 171 vacated; and 35 have been destroyed by fire during past week. Under Epidemic Diseases Act Government have empowered municipal commissioner of his own authority and without reference to the magistrate (1) to prohibit use of dwellings unfit for habitation; (2) to acquire abatement of overcrowding; (3) to require vacation of buildings and premises for cleansing and disinfecting; (4) to forcibly enter deserted buildings and cleanse and disinfect them; (5) to remove earth from floors; (6) to cut off water connections; (7) to demolish whole or part of buildings unfit for habitation; (8) to destroy clothing, &c. Arrangements have been made for emptying all out-going trains at stations outside Bombay, and for strict medical inspection of all passengers. One indigenous case occurred in Poona cantonment, where conservancy and cleansing operations had been greatly improved and every precaution taken. In Poona city increase from 43 to 47 cases during the week, but concentrated in certain quarters, and hitherto no tendency to spread observed; general cleansings, disinfecting operations active; infected houses vacated, disinfected, and opened to sun and air; segregation camp for inmates ready, but not willingly resorted to; they prefer leaving Poona. Difficulty in inducing declaration of cases and removal to hospital. In Coorla cases diminished; in Bondore, Bhiwandri, and also in rest of Thana district cases increased; in Surat district local cases reported from two villages. Possibilities of extension of plague to new localities very carefully watched and all local officers on alert. Karachi—Correct number plague deaths for week ended February 12th, 269: February 5th, 297; January 29th, 181; January 22nd, 206. Mortality chiefly concentrated poorest Muhammadan quarter, and there some difficulty was found in detecting cases. Muhammadan officials at work among them. 600 Muhammadans gone into health camp; infected huts burnt or pulled down. Hindu health camp doing well; evacuation of infected houses enforced and re-occupation not allowed. No indigenous cases in Sind outside Karachi. Extensive powers given to all district officers under Epidemic Diseases Act."

February 15th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Warlike Operations) (Killed and Wounded).—On the motion of Mr. LOUGH a "Return was granted showing the number of Sailors and Soldiers Killed or Wounded in War or Warlike Operations, carried on by the Government of India during the years 1895 and 1896, respectively, (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 154, of Session 1898.)"

THE NIZAM'S REVENUES.

Mr. MONK asked the Secretary of State for India whether a loan was about to be issued in London on the security of the Nizam's revenues:

And, whether the Secretary of State's approval had been obtained; and, if it had not, whether the issue would be in contravention of an existing statute.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have received no information from India as to the raising of such a loan, nor has my consent or that of the Government of India been asked, as required under the terms of the statute 37 Geo. III., chapter 142, section 28. I am advised that any British subject directly or indirectly concerned in raising any money by way of loan for a native State in India, without the consent of the Secretary of State in Council or of the Governor-General or one of the Governors in Council, previously had and obtained in writing, commits a misdemeanour, and the bonds and securities held or taken become null and void.

OFFICERS ON LEAVE.

MR. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Government of India had decided to place the steamers of the North German Lloyd line on the same footing as those of British companies in respect to the exemption from penalties of Officers overstaying their leave through delay in the arrival of the vessel in which they returned to India:

And, whether any North German Lloyd steamers now run on the mail lines to India.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The answer to the first part of the honourable member's question is in the affirmative. So far as I am aware the North German Lloyd steamers run to Aden and Colombo, but not to any port in India.

February 16th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RAILWAY EXTENSION.

East India (Extension of Railways by Private Agency).—On the motion of **MR. M. M. BHOWAGORKE** a return was granted, showing the terms offered by the Government of India in their Resolutions in the Public Works Department, dated the 15th day of September 1893, the 29th day of March 1895, and the 17th day of April 1896, respectively, for the Construction of Railways in India by Private Agency, with a list of the applications for concessions for the Construction of Railways received since the issue of the first of those Resolutions.

THE MERCHANDISE MARKS ACT.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT asked the President of the Board of Trade if he could state upon what grounds the Lords of the Treasury had decided that the placing on tins imported from Germany a map of Southern India and Ceylon with the Union Jack, and below it representations of her Majesty's Indian subjects, could not be held to convey an indication to a purchaser that the tins were British made, and coming therefore within the terms of the Merchandise Marks Act:

And, if he could inform the House why such matters were referred to the Lords of the Treasury, and were not decided by her Majesty's Customs and the Board of Trade, which under the Amending Act of 1891 had to make regulations for the prosecution of offences affecting trade.

MR. HANBURY: The marks of which the hon. member complains appear to convey no indication as to the country in which the tin was made, but to be merely a part of its ornamentation. Indeed, the various types of female beauty, which have no doubt attracted the eye of my hon. and gallant friend—(laughter)—appear to indicate an origin quite distinct from this country. The answer to the second paragraph of the question is that by section 2 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, the Board of Customs are, in all matters and things relating to the execution of their duties, subject to the control of the Treasury.

February 18th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HEALTH OF THE ARMY.

RETURN GRANTED.

On the motion of **MR. JEFFREYS** a Return was granted for the years 1894 and 1895, as regards the United Kingdom and

foreign stations, showing separately for the United Kingdom, Bengal, Madras, Bombay, Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Egypt, Canada, Bermuda, West Indies, Jamaica, South Africa, Mauritius, Ceylon, Straits Settlements, and Hong Kong, the average annual strength of the troops, the admissions of soldiers to hospital, and the ratio of admissions per thousand of mean strength for primary venereal sores, secondary syphilis, and gonorrhoea, respectively, together with the total numbers constantly sick from these causes, and the ratio constantly sick from such causes per thousand of mean strength; the Return to specify any changes which have been made during the period it covers in the nomenclature of the diseases referred to, showing the general effect on the subsequent statistics in the Return, with the dates when such changes were made (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 153, of Session 1894-5).

THE ARMY IN INDIA.

DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MAJOR RASON asked the Secretary of State for India, if he could say when the Departmental Committee of Enquiry on the Health of the army in India would produce their report:

And, whether it would be placed in the hands of members, when printed.

LORD G. HAMILTON: It is hoped that the report will be complete in a few days. I propose, after I have had time to consider it, to make it public.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

OFFICIAL RETICENCE AS TO MORTALITY.

MR. ROBINSON SOUTAR (on behalf of Sir W. Wedderburn) asked the Secretary of State for India whether, pending the receipt of the complete statistics of mortality which had been called for, he would give the House an approximate estimate (based upon the reports of the local officials) of the number of deaths, up to the present date, believed to be due to famine in the various affected districts.

SIR J. FRANKSON asked whether the noble lord the Secretary of State for India would consider the desirability of not disturbing officers in their beneficent labours in looking after distressed people by calling upon them to prepare returns of unnecessary statistics.

LORD G. HAMILTON: As I stated in reply to a previous question by the honourable member, I shall include in the famine papers to be laid on the Table from time to time all the information received from India regarding mortality in the famine districts; and I have called for monthly mortality returns for all famine tracts in which the mortality was considerably above the normal. The second set of famine papers which I hope to lay on the Table by Monday will contain partial information on the matter. I do not think it right to present to the House conjectural estimates in anticipation of correct information or to ask the Government of India, whose time is more than filled up by urgent practical work, to transfer any portion of their attention from such work to the framing of speculative estimates of mortality.

THE ARMY IN INDIA.

GENERAL RUSSELL asked the Under Secretary of State for War, whether he had any objection to state the names of the members of the Departmental Committee which had been appointed to inquire into the health of the army in India:

And, whether he could state when it was probable that the report of the Committee would be completed.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The members of the Departmental Committee appointed to report on the health of the army in India are Lord Onslow, President; Sir James Pelle, member of the Council of India; Surgeon-Major General W. Taylor, Army Medical Department; Surgeon-Colonel J. Richardson, Indian Medical Service (retired.) It is hoped that the report may be ready in a few days for consideration by the Secretary of State.

THE ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE.

MR. BUCHANAN asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether the increase of pay announced by him for the Army

Medical Service was to be paid by the Indian or by the British Exchequer.

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: Service in India is paid for by the Government of India. The Secretary of State for India has granted this increase of pay after full consideration, and the new regulations promulgating it will be issued by the Indian Government.

Mr. BUCHANAN inquired whether the proposal for this increase of pay originated with the Government of India; or, if not, whether their consent was obtained before this extra charge was laid on Indian finances.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I believe in the first instance it was suggested by the War Office, then correspondence ensued and the India Office agreed to the proposal.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Were the Government of India consulted?

LORD G. HAMILTON: Yes.

February 19th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. THE INDIAN TEA INDUSTRY.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the serious danger with which the Indian tea industry was threatened by the proposal of the Indian Government to allow pilgrims for Mecca to embark at Diamond Harbour; and what steps he proposed to take in the matter.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON replied that he was in communication with the Government of India on the subject, and he expected to hear that the pilgrimage from India had been suspended altogether for the present.

THE CHITRAL MEDAL.

During the discussion on the Army Estimates (vote of £54,800 for miscellaneous effective services),

Mr. COURKENAY WARNER asked when the medals for the Chitral Expedition would be issued.

Mr. POWELL WILLIAMS replied that provision was made for them in the vote, and he hoped their issue would not be delayed.

Dr. TANNER: Where are they made? (Order, order.)

February 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. THE FAMINE IN INDIA. SUGGESTED GRANT IN AID.

Mr. S. SMITH asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the immense extent of the famine area in India, and the heavy drain it would entail on the finances of that

country, the Government would take into consideration the expediency of making a grant in aid of India from the Exchequer of this country.

Mr. BALFOUR said he had nothing to add to the answer he gave to a similar question on January 21st. He would remind the hon. member that in a few weeks the Finance Minister of India would make his official statement to the House.

MORTALITY IN THE CENTRAL PROVINCES.

Mr. BHOWNAGGERE asked the Secretary of State for India, if he had received any information regarding the mortality caused in connexion with the famine in the Central Provinces and other districts of India up to a recent date; and, if so, if he would furnish the number and other details regarding the same.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have received the following information regarding mortality in the Central Provinces:—Total deaths in 1895, 349,137; 1896, 468,469. The latter year was exceptionally unhealthy, and it appears that cholera deaths were 37,479 in excess over those in 1895; fever, 59,342; diarrhoea and dysentery, 9,566; smallpox, 1,103; other causes, 11,842. This mortality gives for the whole year a death-rate of 36·03 per 1,000 in 1895, and of 49·03 per 1,000 in 1896 on the present population.

INDIAN MAILS.

Sir J. LING asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether, in view of the threatened difficulties to the transit of the Indian mails through France and other European countries on account of the plague at Bombay, and the possibility of the existing mail service being interfered with, arrangements will be considered for conveying the Indian mails from Port Said direct to this country; whether he is aware that the distance by sea between Port Said and Plymouth is almost identical with that between New York and Plymouth, which has been done by mail steamers in little more than six days; and whether, in the event of serious interruption of the overland mail service, either in consequence of quarantine regulations or international complications, an expeditious sea service can be provided.

Mr. HANBURY: No objection has yet been raised to the transit of mails from India through Italy and France; and in the event of that route being interrupted hereafter, the hon. member may rest assured that every effort will be made to secure the conveyance of the mails to this country by sea as quickly as possible. His calculations as to distances are accurate, but the shortest voyage from New York to Plymouth occupied about six days and a-half, and the average length of the passages was nearer seven than six days. He is of course aware that the conditions of the passenger trade have not developed nearly so high a sea speed on the lines to and from the East as on the New York line; that on the latter there are few steamers afloat that can accomplish the voyage to New York in a little over six days, and these are not available for the Mediterranean and Eastern service.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, W.]

VOL. VIII.

Parliamentary Report No. 3.

APRIL, 1897.

This Supplement consists of a FULL Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from February 25th to March 25th.

Imperial Parliament.

February 25th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE CLOSING OF THE MINTS.

Sir HENRY MEYSEY-THOMPSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether any coins had been struck at the Indian Mints either for the Government or anyone else since the date when the privilege of getting rupees coined was withdrawn from the public.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The only coins which have been struck at the Indian Mints since June, 1893 (with the exception of the coinage of silver in transit at that time) are (1) silver coins representing fractions of the rupee, to the value of of Rs. 504,624; (2) copper coins for the Indian Government, for native States, for the British East Africa Company, and for the Straits and Ceylon Governments; and (3) British dollars, for Eastern trade, at the request of the Colonial Office.

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

Mr. ROBERT CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for India if he would state what were the terms of the reference to the Departmental Committee now sitting on the subject of venereal disease among British troops in India:

Whether the evidence taken by the Committee would be circulated as soon as complete:

And, whether the House would be afforded an opportunity of discussing the question before any action was taken by the Imperial or the Indian Governments.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The terms of reference were as follows: "To examine the official returns of venereal disease among British troops stationed in India, and to report what changes, if any, have taken place during recent years in the prevalence of such disease and in its character and intensity; also, to obtain and report any information which may be available with regard to the presence of venereal disease and its character and intensity among foreign armies." The report is now under my consideration, and will be published. The evidence on which it is founded being almost entirely documentary, has not been separately recorded, but is embodied or referred to in the Report. I am at present unable to say what course may be taken by Her Majesty's Government; but, undoubtedly, the House will have an opportunity of discussing any decision we may arrive at.

March 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

GODAVERI RIVER NAVIGATION WORKS.

Mr. PRICE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the statement of Sir Arthur

Cotton, as published in the "Friend of China," that the Godavari River might at this moment be pouring rice into the famine districts of the North in immense quantities, at a nominal cost of carriage of one penny a bushel, if only the several pieces of canal in the 1,000 miles between were united, which they might be for the cost of 20 miles of railway;

And, whether the Indian Government would consider the advisability of shortly undertaking the necessary works.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Godavari River navigation works, to which the hon. member's question relates, were carefully considered by the Government of the Central Provinces, the Government of India, and the Secretary of State in Council in 1871; and all these authorities agreed that the works should not be proceeded with. The large expenditure involved would have been out of all proportion, not only to the prospects of traffic, but to the amount of protection from famine which the undertaking might have afforded. There is no reason to believe that the Government of India have any intention of now proceeding with the scheme.

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

Captain PRICE asked the Secretary of State for India if he could give any information as to the precise date of publication of the Report of the Departmental Committee on the health of the British troops in India, which was at present under his consideration.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have nothing to add to the answers I have already made to this question.

THE "WARREN HASTINGS."

Mr. PERCY THORNTON asked the Secretary of State for India whether similar compensation for the loss of property would be allowed to the officers and crew wrecked in the royal Indian marine ship *Warren Hastings* as that granted to the troops who were on board when the catastrophe occurred.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Compensation is admissible for loss of property by shipwreck, and will be allowed to the officers and men of the royal Indian marine ship *Warren Hastings*. (Cheers.)

Mr. THORNTON: Whereas those most active in saving life suffered the most in loss of property, not having time to attend to such matters. I desire to ask a question regarding a concrete case which I can vouch for, and I believe not to be isolated. Will the noble lord give consideration to the case of Lieutenant Walter Wyndham, who was the first man to take a rope over the bow and reach the land, afterwards saving five lives from drowning, and being recommended for the Humane Society's medal by Commander Holland. He has lost all his property which was on the ship.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: No doubt the exceptional conduct of Lieutenant Wyndham will be considered, but I do not think it would entitle him to special compensation for the loss of his property.

Mr. THORNTON: These men have lost everything they had,

March 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

NET INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

On the motion of Sir H. H. FOWLER, a Return was granted showing the net income and expenditure of British India, under certain specified heads for the eleven years from 1885-6 to 1895-6.

THE CASH BALANCES.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would inform the House what was the present amount of the cash balances of the Indian Government, and in what proportion they were held in its home treasury in sterling and in India in rupees:

If he would state how much of the balances held in India in rupees was in the Indian Government's own treasuries, and how much was out on deposit in the Presidency banks.

And, whether he could give the sum now advanced on the money market from the Indian Government's home treasury.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: 1. On the 31st January the cash balances in India amounted to Rs. 11,400,000. The cash balance of the home treasury this morning was £2,099,462.

2. It cannot at present be stated with accuracy how the balances in India on the 31st January were divided between the Government's own treasuries and those of the Presidency banks. The Government deposits in the latter during the last week of January seem, however, to have amounted to about Rs. 2,890,000; and the remainder which would be about Rs. 8,510,000, must have been distributed over the Government treasuries, which are very numerous.

3. The amount now out at short dates on loan from the home treasury is £1,550,000.

THE INDIAN MAILS.

Sir JOHN LENO asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, what number of tenders were received for the Indo-China and Australian mail contracts; whether they were all from British companies:

And, whether both with regard to speed and rates of subsidy, the tender of the Peninsular and Oriental Shipping Company was in all respects the most advantageous.

Mr. R. W. HANBURY: Tenders for the India, China, and Australia mail services, or for portions of them were received from four companies. All the tenders received were from British companies. The only opportunity of obtaining a complete service to and from the whole of the British possessions concerned was to accept offers of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company. When the contracts with these companies are signed, they will be laid before the House for confirmation, and will be accompanied by a Treasury minute giving full particulars of all the tenders received.

March 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE DESAI OF BADAMI.

On the motion of Sir W. WEDDERBURN, a Return was granted for copy of correspondence relating to a memorial from the Desai of Badami, claiming certain holdings in the Bijapur and Dharwar districts of the Bombay Presidency.

THE IMPERIAL MUSEUM, CALCUTTA.

Mr. M. M. BROWNAGGERS asked the Secretary of State for India whether a German gentleman was recently appointed to an important position in the Imperial Museum at Calcutta; whether, before filling up that post, the Government of India had made any endeavour to find a native of India competent to fill it; and whether, with reference to this appointment and any other similar appointments to which Indian gentlemen of education and special attainments would seem to justly have the first claim, any correspondence had taken place during the past few years between the Secretary of State for India and the Government in India; and if so, would he place such correspondence upon the Table of the House.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: In the early part of last year the trustees of the Indian Museum at Calcutta, after making

inquiries, decided, subject to the approval of the Government of India and of the Secretary of State in Council, to appoint Dr. Bloch for a term of five years to the post of first assistant on account of his very exceptional qualifications for the performance of the special duties attached to it. The Government of India recommended the appointment for approval. The Secretary of State in Council, after careful consideration, decided not to withhold his sanction, but intimated his opinion that the post was one which might appropriately be filled by a qualified native of India, and that in future candidates for such appointments should in the first instance be sought among graduates of the Indian Universities. I shall be ready to lay on the Table the correspondence to which the hon. member refers if he will move for it.

ENTERIC FEVER.

General RUSSELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the great increase of enteric fever in India; whether the medical authorities could give any explanation for this increase; and whether the Government proposed to take any steps for the better enforcement of sanitary regulations at the various stations where this complaint had recently been most prevalent.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have noticed with regret the increase of enteric fever in India, the causes of which are still very obscure. The Government of India have adopted various measures for improving the sanitation and water supply of cantonments, and the question as to the means of checking this disease is one which is constantly engaging their attention.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

ARE THERE ANY DEATHS?

THE NESCIENCE OF THE INDIA OFFICE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the statements of Reuter's Correspondent that in the poorhouse at Nagpur deaths occur daily, and that in one village in the Central Provinces over twenty deaths from actual starvation had occurred before 4th February; and whether he was in possession of any information as to the total deaths from famine up to date.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have seen the statements to which the hon. member refers, but they are associated with explanations which are as worthy of attention as the statements themselves. The second set of famine papers, which have been in the hands of the printers for ten days and which will soon be ready, contain all the information I have received regarding famine mortality, including a comparative statement of the total deaths in the Central Provinces from all causes for the years 1895 and 1896.

Mr. J. G. SWIFT MACNEILL asked when the noble lord could answer the question, and whether at Nagpur deaths were not occurring daily.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: There must be a lapse of time between the collection of statistics in India and their arrival here, and that cannot be reduced to less than three months. If there is exceptional mortality I have directed the Indian Government to inform me.

Mr. MACNEILL said he really must press the noble lord as to whether, aye or no, deaths were not taking place at Nagpur daily. [Ministerial cries of "Order."]

The SPEAKER said the question had already been answered.

THE INDIA COUNCIL.

WANTED: AN INDIAN MEMBER.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in filling up the approaching vacancies in the India Council, he would consider the expediency of appointing an experienced and representative Indian.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The suggestion which the hon. baronet puts forward is one which I have already considered, but I have not been able to find that association of recent administrative experience and general representation of native views sufficiently combined in one individual to enable me to act upon it.

Sir W. WENDERSBURG asked the Secretary of State whether he had considered the claims of the Indian gentlemen who were members of the Viceroy's Council, or of one of the Provincial Legislative Councils in India.

Lord G. HAMILTON was understood to reply that none of these gentlemen, in his opinion, possessed the requisite qualities for the India Council.

March 8th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

IRRIGATION WORKS.

Mr. R. G. WEBSTER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was in a position to inform the House, having regard to the large sums of public money now being expended in India in relief works, if the Government of India were carrying forward irrigation works of importance in the parts of India now affected by famine for the mitigation or prevention of subsequent scarcity of food in those districts in the future.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: In addition to the minor irrigation works which have been recently undertaken in relief of famine, the Government of India are engaged in the construction of very considerable irrigation projects, averaging a capital expenditure of three-quarters of a crore of rupees per annum up to the year 1900. These projects will largely afford protection in the future to the parts now affected by famine, besides affording similar relief in portions of India which have not been affected on this occasion.

THE WRECK OF THE "WARREN HASTINGS."

Captain CHALONER asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether any Report had been received at the War Office of the circumstances attending the wreck of the "Warren Hastings" on the island of Réunion; and whether the Report could be made public.

Mr. BRODBROOK: Reports have been received from the officers commanding the wings of the Kings Royal Rifles and the York and Lancaster Regiment and other details on board the "Warren Hastings," and also from the officer commanding the ship. It appears that the ship got out of her course and struck the rocks soon after 2 o'clock on a pitch-dark night. The troops, numbering over 1,000, were mustered at once, and the captain of the ship reports that but for the perfect discipline observed and the prompt obedience to every order given, many lives must necessarily have been lost. I propose to lay the Reports on the Table, and I think the House will feel that the individual acts of heroism in saving life recorded in them, and the perfect order maintained during the landing of the women and children in darkness, with the ship at an angle of fifty degrees and momentarily expected to capsize, are worthy to be recorded in the annals of the regiments and of the British Army. (Cheers.)

March 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

FOOD GRAINS.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was able to give the House any information as to the estimated quantity of food grains in local stocks in India in January, 1897; the quantity of food grains imported into British India during the past six months; and the actual or expected out-turn of the rabi or cold weather crops in India during the present season.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The further famine papers which will, I hope, shortly be distributed to hon. members, give the latest information on the topics of my hon. friend's question. Meanwhile I may state: (1) During last month the Government of India reported that visible supplies of food were sufficient for daily requirements throughout India; if failure of stocks were anticipated, prices would rise, but they have not risen. It is not possible to ascertain correctly the amount

of food stocks in each famine tract; but, at present, apprehension regarding the sufficiency of food stocks is not felt by the Government of India or the local governments, except in isolated areas of North-East Behar, where the local government has been authorised to take special measures to aid private trade; I have further consulted some of the leading traders in food grains, and they endorse the Government forecast. (2) The latest import figures that have reached me are for last December. During the last three months of 1896, the foreign importations of grain into India were 27,179 tons, as compared with 1,567 tons in the corresponding quarter of 1895. These figures do not include importations from Burma, which has this season an exportable surplus of over 1,600,000 tons of rice. Up to the middle of February, 80,000 tons of the Burma surplus had been shipped to India, and tonnage had been engaged for twenty or thirty thousand more. Knowledge of the Burma surplus was said to be keeping down prices of food in Bengal. (3) Fair spring crops are expected in parts of the Punjab, North-West Provinces, and Oudh. In the Central Provinces, the yield of the spring harvest is poor.

Sir J. KENNAWAY asked whether the noble lord could give any information as to the price of food in the various famine districts at the present time.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Seeing that the country over which the famine extends covers an area over three times as great as that of England, Scotland and Ireland, it would be impossible for me to give information of the kind. But if my hon. friend would give me due notice, I would be able to indicate what the price of food is. For the information of the House I may say that the practice of the Indian Government in famine operations is to pay in money sums sufficient to provide what is known as a sustenance wage, and if the price of food is high, the amount paid is in proportion.

FAMINE RELIEF.

WANTED: ADEQUATE MEASURES.

Mr. LEUTY asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that people in India were admittedly dying of hunger in unknown numbers, and that such a state of things necessarily indicated considerable suffering on the part of others not actually brought to death, he would take immediate steps to make more effective the work of famine relief.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The question of the hon. gentleman implies that the system of famine relief now in operation in India is ineffective and insufficient. No evidence, either official or unofficial, has reached me justifying this allegation. In the middle of last month the Government of India telegraphed that "in all provinces relief arrangements were reported to be adequate and working well." Subsequent telegrams from the Government and unofficial information have confirmed that report. I am not at present aware of any steps that can be taken to make the work of relief more effective; if any such measures can be suggested, they will be welcomed. I believe that the executive in India, their officers, and the large number of non-official workers now engaged in relief operations are doing all that can be done to mitigate distress, and the whole administrative and financial resources of the Government are behind them. A calamity so intense and widespread as that now afflicting India cannot be repelled without casualties and great privation; but, never before in a scarcity of these dimensions, have the general operations against famine been so successful as those now being carried on by Lord Elgin and his coadjutors.

Mr. LEUTY asked whether he correctly understood the noble Lord the other day that three months would be required to find out how many had died from famine, and whether he was right in inferring that people were dying in unknown numbers?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: If the hon. gentleman thinks that a calamity of these dimensions could pass over India without raising the mortality above the level which obtains in normal times he stands alone in that opinion. What I pointed out was, it was impossible to obtain in less than three months reliable information as to the mortality that has occurred; and I think it is better the officials administering relief should try and preserve the lives of those living than be burdened by collecting statistics of those who have died. ("Hear.")

Mr. LEWIS asked the Secretary of State for India, what relief was being given in the famine districts of India in the matter of payment of the land revenue; and, what steps were being taken to preserve the cattle belonging to the suffering people in view of their future needs.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: My latest information shows that the Government of India expect their land revenue for the year ending on the 31st of this month to be Rs. 2,300,000 short, by reason of suspensions and remissions due to famine. These suspensions are apart from other losses of revenue and from the large sums spent on relief operations and on loans to landholders. The Government forest reserves are being, or have been, opened for grazing wherever such a step was required for the cattle of famine-stricken tracts. In one province a Forest officer of experience has been deputed to help private dealers in making the best use of fodder available in the Government forests. Water from Government irrigation works is being made available—as far as practicable—for the production of fodder crops; and, generally, the governments and the local officers are doing what is in their power to help in saving the people's cattle.

THE "DIAMOND JUBILEE."

Sir JOHN LING asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether he would consider the practicability of associating the Crimean and Indian Mutiny veterans with the celebrations in honour of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee by selecting a detachment to form a guard to the children's stand in Hyde Park, or elsewhere, providing each man with a suitable uniform, and giving each a moderate gratuity on the day of the celebration.

Mr. BRODRICK: The suggestion in the hon. Member's question will, with many others, be considered; but the selection of men to form such a detachment would present great difficulties, and it is impossible at this stage to give any undertaking in the matter.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS FOR THE PUNJAB AND BURMA.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether it was intended to constitute a Lieutenant-Governorship for the province of Burma, and to establish Legislative Councils in the Punjab and Burma;

And, whether he was able to give the House any information as to the constitution and powers of those Councils

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It has been decided that local Legislative Councils shall be established both for the Punjab and for Burma, and as soon as the formal proclamations have been issued the Chief Commissioner of the latter province will be appointed to be a Lieutenant-Governor.

There will be nine members of Council for each legislature, four of whom will be non-officials. For the present they will all be nominated. The powers to be given to these Councils will be gradually extended, as we gain experience of their working, but it is not proposed in the first instance to give them the larger powers which under the Act of 1892 may be conferred by rule or regulation.

THE BURMA-SIAM-CHINA RAILWAY.

Mr. SCHWANN asked the Secretary of State for India what action the Government of India had taken, in the fulfilment of the promises given by the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Home and Indian Governments, to the deputation of the Associated Chambers of Commerce in June last, and subsequent memorial of the Chambers, to carry out at State expense the necessary surveys, levels and estimates for the section of the projected Burma-Siam-China Railway leading from the Burmese seaport of Moulmien to the Siamese frontier, in order to enable some powerful and solvent company to undertake and execute this section of the line.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The statement made by the Prime Minister to the Deputation from the Associated Chambers of Commerce on the 12th June last was to the effect that, if a powerful and solvent company were formed for the suggested Burma-Siam-China Railway, such assistance as was deemed possible by Government would be given towards the construction of that portion of the line which lay in British Indian territory. In pursuance of this undertaking, the views of the Chambers of Commerce in support of the project were trans-

mitted to the Government of India in August last for an expression of their opinion. That Government have recently replied deprecating any expenditure from Indian revenues which might commit them to the execution of this project until the manner in which such a line is to be financed has been discussed and determined.

THE BURMA-CHINESE CONVENTION.

Mr. SCHWANN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the new Burma Frontier Treaty provided for the retrocession by China to the British of the Shan State of Kiang Hung, and for the extension of the projected Burma-Siam-China Railway and other railways from our Burmese dominions into the neighbouring provinces of China; and, when the Treaty would be laid upon the Table of the House.

Mr. GEORGE CURZON: Under the Burma Frontier Convention, as revised, certain territorial compensations, including the State of Kokang, are made to Great Britain for the violation by the Chinese Government of that portion of the original agreement that related to Kiang Hung. It is further agreed that, if railways be constructed in Yun-nan, they shall be connected with any Burmese lines that may have been laid to the frontier. I cannot at present answer the third question, as the Treaty has not yet reached our hands.

March 11th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE PLAGUE IN INDIA.

Lord REAY expressed his satisfaction with the vigorous measures which had been taken by the local authorities in Bombay to deal with insanitary buildings. This was a very great opportunity for dealing in a thorough manner with the sanitary needs of the city of Bombay, and he trusted that the local authorities would receive all the support and financial aid they deserved in attaining the aim and object which they had at heart. It was under the influence of the prevalent disease that the authorities would naturally enlist more easily that co-operation of those most interested which would facilitate the carrying out of measures which in ordinary times often met with a good deal of opposition. Having noticed that Dr. Yersin had reached Bombay, he ventured to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether any reports had been received of the results of Dr. Yersin's operations since his arrival, and any steps taken to prepare the Yersin serum in Bombay, and to provide a supply of it to the towns of Poona, Karachi, Surat, and to other localities in which the disease had declared itself; and what further information had been received with reference to Professor Haffkine's inoculations, the degree of protection they afford, and the time during which they remain operative?

The EARL OF ONSLOW: The noble Lord has a very intimate acquaintance with the locality in which the plague unfortunately is now prevalent—namely, the Presidency of Bombay, and I am very glad to hear from his lips that he approves of the steps taken by the Government of Bombay to combat the plague. Steps have not been taken in the town of Bombay only, but equally vigorous measures have been taken in Karachi and Poona, and I can assure the noble lord that the sanction of the Secretary of State will not be refused to any expenditure which may be deemed by the Government of Bombay necessary to combat the plague. With regard to the question the noble lord has addressed to me, I have to say that Dr. Yersin has returned to Bombay, and the only intelligence that we have yet received is that he reached Bombay and began work on March 6th; the effect of his remedy on plague patients only a day or two ill is reported to be "surprisingly good," while cases of old standing are said to be "not so much benefited." Information has not yet been received regarding attempts to provide or use Dr. Yersin's or Professor Haffkine's serum at Poona and Karachi. Regarding operations with Professor Haffkine's serum, the following further information has been received. Up to and including March 7, 2,341 persons had been inoculated, of whom only two (in addition to the two described in my answer to the noble Lord on February 16) have been attacked by plague; both attacks occurred within five days of inoculation, and both sufferers are alive. People are coming forward more freely to be inocu-

lated, and the practice is extending. The Government of Bombay are preparing an organisation for the extension of depôts for purposes of inoculation and for instructing medical officers in the process. Steps are also being taken by the Government of Bombay for popularising prophylactic inoculation and for increasing the amount of lymph that can be produced. The Secretary of State will receive information weekly of the extent to which the practice is resorted to, with reports as to its efficacy, and those I shall be willing to furnish the noble lord with from time to time if he should so desire.

VISCOUNT CURZEN said their lordships might not know it, but the man who was combating this great disease in Bombay was a German. He believed the man who thought he could combat successfully the cholera was a German, or, at all events, a foreigner. The man who had gone to the Cape to fight rinderpest was also a German. He knew there were men in England quite as able to do these things as foreigners; it was only a matter of money.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA. THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

LORD WENLOCK asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether he could give any information as to the manner in which the Mansion House Fund had been and would be expended in India; and whether there was ample scope for the beneficial application of the money if the amount subscribed were to reach a figure considerably higher than the present total. Their lordships were aware that the Lord Mayor of London had started what was known as the Mansion House Fund, and had appealed to the public to assist him in raising money for the relief of the distress in India. The public had responded most nobly to the appeal, but it appeared to him it would be a very good thing if the information he asked for could be given, not only for the satisfaction of those who had already responded to the appeal, but of those who were still withholding their subscriptions.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: As to the second question of the noble lord, I can at once answer that there is abundant scope for the employment of such funds. But the noble lord asks me whether I can give him any information as to the way in which the money has been spent by the Committee in India. The noble lord will perhaps have observed that in the Blue Book of Famine Papers which has been presented, the Government of India have laid down the objects to which it is proposed to apply this fund, and we are informed that the Central Committee has applied the money in the manner specified. They have allotted 21 lakhs to provincial committees for urgent demands, and they will make further large distributions shortly. The provincial committees are understood to be working on the lines defined by Government, but are being asked to report their working for the information of the Secretary of State. With regard to the amount which may be required as compared with the amount which has been subscribed, the noble lord is no doubt aware that the Mansion House Fund now amounts to about £411,000. In addition to that, considerable sums have been remitted direct from Lancashire, Glasgow, and other places, and besides that a large subscription has been raised in India. Subscriptions have also been started in the United States, in Canada, and in our Australian colonies. We do not know what amounts those have reached, but no doubt a considerable sum will be collected. But really the whole question of how much is likely to be able to be profitably utilised by the Central Committee depends entirely upon the nature of the next monsoon. If the next monsoon is, as we all hope, a good one, and there is reason for the hope, the amount of the funds which will be provided will be adequate to deal with the emergency. But if it should be otherwise, it is almost impossible to exaggerate or overstate the amount which may be required to provide for so lamentable a contingency. I ought to add that there has not, in these considerations, been taken into account what may be required by the native States, but, excluding that, the Government of India believe that with a good monsoon 140 lakhs—that is, something between £900,000 and £908,000—ought to be sufficient to enable them to cope with the immediate requirements of the situation. But I need hardly assure your lordships that every sixpence which is subscribed by the public, either at home or in our colonies, will be utilised by the Central Committee in India in the re-establishment of some of those unfortunate people, who, after their immediate and pressing necessities have been

relieved by the Government of India, will have to be started again in life to pursue their ordinary avocations.

LORD OVERSTON asked whether any special effort would be made to secure the co-operation of the missionaries of the various denominations. At the end of the last famine missionaries were asked to undertake the care of orphans. Would anything similar be done on the present occasion?

THE EARL OF ONSLOW understood that the Central Committee would gladly welcome the assistance of missionary societies.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE "WARREN HASTINGS."

MR. JAMES ROCHE asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether he could give, even approximately, the average length of service of the soldiers on board the *Warren Hastings*, the conspicuous steadiness and discipline of whom, under such trying circumstances, entirely contributed to the immunity from a grave loss of life when that ship was recently wrecked on the island of Réunion.

MR. POWELL-WILLIAMS: The average service of the soldiers on board the *Warren Hastings* was probably between four and five years, which is the average of all foreign battalions.

MR. P. J. POWER asked whether it was not a fact that most of the non-commissioned officers and rank and file of this regiment, which displayed such marvellous discipline and steadiness on the occasion referred to, were Irishmen. (Laughter.)

MR. POWELL-WILLIAMS said he had no information upon this point.

March 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

THANKS TO RUSSIA.

MR. M. M. BROWNAGGER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the thanks of Her Majesty's Government were recently tendered to the Government of the Czar for the help and relief extended by Russia to the people of India in the distress caused by the prevailing famine; and, if so, would he state the amount of money, grain, or any other form of help in which the Russian Government and people were stated to have offered succour to the sufferers.

MR. G. CURZEN: The thanks of Her Majesty's Government have been communicated to the Russian Government for the assistance offered by them in relief of the Indian famine. But we have not as yet received any information as to the amounts of money or grain which they may have despatched to India.

March 16th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

PRICES OF GRAIN.

SIR JOHN KENNEDY asked the Secretary of State for India whether, seeing that the Viceroy had stated that the whole course of operations in relief of famine must depend largely on the course of prices, he would arrange with the Indian Government to give in its weekly telegram the prices of different grains in two or three chief towns in the worst part of the famine districts, e.g., for Bengal, Mohkhari and Durbhanga; for Central Provinces, Jabalpur, and Raipur.

Whether he would state the nature of the special measures to aid private trade which the Government of Bengal had been authorised to take in Behar.

And what action had been already taken to carry them out.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I have asked the Government of India to add to its weekly telegram a statement of the price of the commonest food grain at one or two places in each famine-stricken province.

A general account of special measures the Bengal Government proposed for stimulating grain trade in a few remote localities will be found in the *Famine Papers* which, I hope, will be presented within the next ten days. The authority for special measures was only to take effect in case of probable failure of supplies.

I have learned from the *Bengal Gazette*, received to-day, that one case of emergency has been reported in Chota Nagpur, but I am not yet able to state the precise procedure adopted by the Government to supplement the food supplies in this district.

March 18th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Copy presented—of Report of a Departmental Committee on the prevalence of Venereal Disease among the British Troops in India (by command); to lie upon the Table.

East India (Contagious Diseases) [No. 2, 1897].—Copy presented—of Memorandum by the Army Sanitary Commission and Correspondence regarding the prevalence of Venereal Disease among the British Troops in India (by command); to lie upon the Table.

THE BEHAR OPIUM AGENCY.

Mr. ARTHUR PEASE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government had any information as to the progress made by the Government of India in arranging that the Behar Opium Agency should deal directly with the cultivators of opium instead of dealing through middlemen.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The subject to which the hon. member refers has not been lost sight of by the Government of India, but I have received no information about it beyond what is contained in the Annual Report on the Administration of the Opium Department for 1895-6. I shall be glad to place a copy of this Report at the disposal of the hon. member for perusal if he wishes it.

HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.

Captain NORTON (on behalf of Captain Pirie) asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was now able to state the approximate date when the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Health of the Army in India would be placed in the hands of members; and if he could state the reasons for the delay in its publication.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I am laying the Report on the Table to-day, and hope that it will be distributed to-morrow.

Major RASCH asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, on the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Health of the British troops in India, the Government would give facilities for its discussion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to my right hon. friend, I have to ask him if he will defer his question until he has had an opportunity of reading the Blue-book, which will be in his hands in a few days.

ENTERIC FEVER.

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether the attention of his Department had been called to the sufferings of the Black Watch at Sabathu, in the Punjab, from the deficient and contaminated water supply, and consequent prevalence of enteric fever:

Whether any steps were being taken to improve the water supply at that station and Dagsbhai:

And whether Kasauli, Solon, and Jutogh, where the water supply had been improved, were now completely free from enteric fever.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It appears from the monthly returns, which have been received up to November last, that enteric fever prevailed in the regiment during April, May, and June, increased in July, August, and September, but diminished greatly in October, while no cases were reported in November.

The Report as to the health of British troops for the year

1896 has not yet reached me, but I will ask the Government of India to expedite it, and also to furnish information as to the water supply of the stations named.

March 22nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE AND THE PLAGUE.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Famine and Relief Operations).—Copy presented—of further Papers on the Famine and Relief Operations in India in 1896-7 (by command); to lie upon the Table.

East India (Bubonic Plague).—Copy presented—of Papers relating to the outbreak of Bubonic Plague in India, with Statement showing the quarantine and other restrictions recently placed upon Indian trade up to March, 1897 (by command); to lie upon the Table.

"ECCLESIASTICAL" PURPOSES.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state the amount drawn annually from the taxation of India for the maintenance of Christian ecclesiastical establishments in that country:

Whether he could give any reasons why the charges of these churches, which exist for the benefit of the English community, should be borne by the taxpayers of India:

And whether, in view of the strain now put upon Indian finances by the famine, he would consider the advisability of devoting the money referred to to purposes of general service of the country.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The total charge upon Indian Revenues for ecclesiastical purposes was Rs. 220,000 in 1895-6, of which sum by far the greater part was spent in pay and establishments for chaplains of various denominations serving with the Army. It has for 200 years been held, and is still held, by the Government of India to be a part of their duty to provide religious ministrations, within reasonable limits, for the European Army in India and for European civilians serving in that country. Both these classes have accepted employment in the expectation and belief that such provision would be made; and there is no intention of making any change in the present arrangements.

Mr. CARVELL WILLIAMS: Will a Return be granted of the details of this expenditure if asked for?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Yes, Sir.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

SUGGESTED GRANT IN AID.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the statement made by Sir James Westland as to the cost of the famine and its effects on the finances of India, he could state in what way the Government were prepared to aid in defraying from Imperial funds part of the expenditure on famine relief.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The state of things in India is at present as follows. In the face of a famine of almost unexampled extent and severity, the Government of India have spared no expense in their efforts to prevent or mitigate its effects; and, thanks to the means which the foresight of previous Governments has provided, and to the zeal and vigour with which they have been used, those efforts have been on the whole very successful. In spite of the very heavy charge and loss of revenue, estimated at Rs. 11,000,000 net, which this condition of affairs has entailed, the Government of India estimate the deficit for the closing financial year at not more than Rs. 1,987,000, and that for the coming year at Rs. 2,464,000. They propose to carry on without interruption or postponement all the great Public Works which they have begun or have undertaken to begin; and mainly for this purpose of productive expenditure, which is virtually a further insurance against future famines, they propose to borrow Rs. 4,000,000 in India and £3,500,000 sterling in England, besides £1,000,000 temporary debt. With the view of insuring against the financial loss involved by possible famines, a surplus revenue has for many years been raised and devoted to the avoidance or reduction of debt, and the loans which it is

now intended to incur form part of the general policy of borrowing for remunerative railway construction, and must not be attributed merely, or even mainly, to the results of the famine. The credit of the Government of India has, I believe, never been appreciably higher than at the present moment. In these circumstances, no application for assistance has been made by the Government of India, nor do Her Majesty's Government, as at present advised, see any reason to anticipate such application by an offer of financial aid.

THE HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.

Major RASCH asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, on the Report of the Departmental Committee on the health of the British troops in India, the Government would give facilities for its discussion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have, with much regret, asked my hon. and gallant friend more than once to put off this question, and I am afraid I must ask him again to postpone it until Thursday, when I hope the Government will be able to make a statement on the subject. (Cheers.)

March 25th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SIMLA EXODUS.

Mr. C. E. SCHWANN, on behalf of Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that the Government of India was about to migrate from Calcutta to Simla:

And, whether any steps would be taken by which, as in former famines, the Viceroy might take personal cognizance of the measures of famine relief in the different Provinces.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware that the Government of India is about to migrate to Simla, from which place the

Viceroy will be in no less rapid and easy communication with the officers in the famine districts than if he were at Calcutta. I may add that, owing to the publication of the famine codes, which established general principles for the administration of relief, the intervention of the supreme Government is not now required, as it was in former famines.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

WAGES ON RELIEF WORKS.

Mr. C. E. SCHWANN, on behalf of Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that there was a general complaint in India that the wages paid to labourers on relief works were insufficient to secure to them one full meal every day:

And, whether, to test the sufficiency of the wages, he would direct that labourers admitted to relief works should be weighed at the time of admission, and should subsequently be weighed from time to time.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not aware of any general complaint as to the insufficiency of the wages paid to labourers on relief works. The famine codes prescribe the rates of wages, which bear a fixed proportion to the local value of food, and rise and fall with it. These rates are intended, as recommended in the report of the Famine Commission, to "provide sufficient food for a labourer's or a dependent's support," with "a margin against accidental error on the side of deficiency." I am also aware that the local Governments and local officers are carefully watching the effect of the wages rates on the condition of the people receiving relief, and the weekly reports state the general condition of those upon relief work as good and fair. The hon. gentleman can hardly be serious in suggesting that in addition to the immense labours devolving upon relief officers should be added the duty of periodically weighing the three millions of men, women, and children who are now in receipt of relief from Government. (Laughter.)

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE GREEN, LONDON, E.W.]

VOL. VIII.

Parliamentary Report No. 4.

MAY, 1897.

This Supplement consists of a FULL Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from March 26th to April 12th.

Imperial Parliament.

March 26th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ORIEL COLLEGE AND INDIAN CIVILIANS.

Sir LEWIS McIVER moved: "That an humble address be presented to her Majesty praying her Majesty to withhold her consent from the statute made by the governing body of Oriel College, Oxford, altering Statute IV. of the statutes of the college by the insertion after the 18th clause of a new clause numbered 18a."

Mr. JAMES BRYCE said he had been requested by the Provost of Oriel College to say, on behalf of the college, that they assented to the motion for the address being carried without a division, in the hope and expectation that the college would be able to frame and carry a provision respecting the selected candidates of the Indian Civil Service as would be approved by the India Office, as the guardians of the interests of that Service, and which they would regard as satisfactory.

Sir JOHN MOWBRAY desired, as the representative of the University of Oxford, to express the great satisfaction with which he had listened to the words of his right hon. friend opposite.

The motion was agreed to.

March 29th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON asked the Secretary of State for India if he would ascertain the views of the Government of India with reference to the protection of the health of the British troops in India before stating to the House the action which her Majesty's Government proposed to take.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have for some time past been in communication with the Viceroy, and I propose to lay on the Table of the House a despatch addressed to the Government of India in which the views of her Majesty's Government are stated at length.

General LAUREN: Can the noble lord say when it is probable that the answer from the Government of India will be obtained?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I think it better for my hon. and gallant friend to read the despatch.

Major RASON: In order to dispel misconception on this question, will the noble lord use his influence with the Government to give the House facilities for its discussion?

Mr. BALFOUR: I hope and believe the despatch is of such a character as not to call for any debate in this House. Perhaps the despatch had therefore be better read first by hon. gentlemen.

"REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS' FUND."

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON obtained leave to introduce a Bill to make provision for the transfer of the Assets, Liabilities, and Management of the Regular Widows' Fund, and of the Elders' Widows' Fund, to the Secretary of State in Council of India, and for other purposes in relation thereto. The Bill was read a first time.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIANS.

On the motion of Mr. M. M. BHOWNAGGHEE, a Return was granted for Copies of Correspondence between the Secretary of State for India and the Supreme and Local Governments in India during the last five years regarding the Appointment of qualified Natives of India to posts in the Educational, Scientific, Medical, and other kindred Departments, which posts have been heretofore filled by Europeans.

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Contagious Diseases) (No. 3, 1897).—Copy presented,—of Representations received by the Secretary of State for India from the Royal College of Surgeons of England and the Royal College of Physicians relative to the prevalence of venereal disease among the British Troops in India [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Contagious Diseases) (No. 4, 1897).—Copy presented,—of Despatch to the Government of India regarding the measures to be adopted for checking the spread of venereal disease among the British Troops in India [by command]: to lie upon the Table.

March 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.

Captain PIRIE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the remarkable variations in the ratios of admissions into hospital from venereal diseases occurring between the various garrison towns in India, as revealed in the recent memorandum of the Army Sanitary Commission and the Report of the Departmental Committee:

And, whether, in view of the important bearing of these variations upon any proposals that might be made for checking these diseases, he would order an enquiry to be made into their cause or causes, either in one or two selected cases or over the whole of the garrisons in India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The hon. gentleman will see from the despatch which will be in the hands of members on Thursday morning that I have already directed the Government of India to institute an enquiry of the nature suggested.

April 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

8. Gopal Ballal Damle.—Petition of Gopal Ballal Damle for redress of grievances; to lie upon the table.

EAST INDIA LOANS.

East India (Loans raised in England).—Copy presented of Return of all loans raised in England chargeable on the revenues of India outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended 31st March, 1897, etc. [by Act]: to lie upon the table.

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPER-ANNUATION.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON obtained leave to introduce a Bill to remove doubts as to the power of the Secretary of State in Council of India to grant superannuation and compensation allowances in certain cases to officers on his establishment. The Bill was read a first time.

INDIAN TROOPS AND THE "DIAMOND JUBILEE."

Mr. M. M. BROWNAGGER asked the Secretary of State for India whether arrangements were completed for the presence of Indian troops on the occasion of her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee; and, if so, would he state how many officers and how many men were expected:

Whether he would ask the Government of India to arrange that of the officers as many as possible should be Native officers:

And, whether it was proposed to include in the contingent any representatives of the volunteer regiments in India, as well as of the Parsees who were enrolled in some of those regiments.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Twenty-one Native officers of Indian cavalry and twenty representatives of the Imperial Service troops are expected from India in order to take part in the celebration of the sixtieth year of her Majesty's reign. I have received no proposals from India for the deputation of any volunteers from that country.

INOCULATION AGAINST PLAGUE.

Sir CHARLES CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the systems of anti-plague inoculation which were being tried in India by Dr. Haffkine and Dr. Yersin, and the statement contained in a recent official despatch from Bombay that 3,296 persons had already been inoculated by Dr. Haffkine:

And, whether, with a view of securing a prompt test of the protective and curative value of the procedures referred to, he would take steps to secure an independent official registration of all anti-plague inoculations, so as to enable the practical efficacy of the systems to be tested by subsequent comparison between the disease and death rates among inoculated and non-inoculated persons.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have been in frequent telegraphic correspondence with the Bombay Government, regarding inoculations against plague.

I have requested the Bombay Government to report periodically the number and the results of inoculations under Dr. Haffkine's and Dr. Yersin's systems separately. As yet I have received no report regarding Dr. Yersin's work beyond the telegram on page 15 of the Plague Papers distributed to hon. members on Tuesday last. The results of inoculation are ascertained and reported as far as possible; as will be seen from the telegrams on pages 15 and 109 of the Blue Book, and from the Bombay Government plague telegram of the 29th March, published in yesterday's newspapers.

April 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.

On the motion of Major RASCH, a Return was granted showing the amount of all classes of venereal disease (including simple Venereal Returns) for all stations where the Act was in force from 1864 to 1893:

And a similar Return for the same stations from 1886 to 1895.

INDIAN BEER.

Mr. RENSHEW asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Indian Government contemplate remitting the present excise duty on beer brewed in India for the use of the troops; and, if so, whether it was intended to make a corresponding remission on customs duty on beer imported into India from this country for the use of the troops.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The contracts for the supply of Indian beer to the troops in India terminate next year. I have not at present received any report tending to show that fresh arrangements are contemplated, but the attention of the Government of India will be drawn to my hon. friend's question.

April 5th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RETIREMENT AND PROMOTION.

Mr. HAZELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the retirement of one of the senior clerks in the Audit Department of the India Office had been sanctioned:

And, whether, as another appointment to the senior class would involve an increase of charge upon Indian revenues, a promotion to a senior clerkship would, in accordance with the course pursued in two cases in 1892-3 in regard to the Accountant-General's Department, be deferred until such time as the official now retired on reduction of establishment would have been superannuated under the age limit, or whether the redundant clerkship could be now abolished.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The retirement of a senior clerk in the India Audit Office has been recently sanctioned and a promotion to the senior class has been made.

This does not involve an increase of charge upon Indian revenues, for, including the pension of the senior clerk who has retired, it results in an immediate saving of £83 a year, and an average annual saving during the next fifteen years of £41.

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPER-ANNUATION BILL.

On the motion for the second reading of this Bill,

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said there were fifteen or sixteen Superannuation Bills at present before the House.

Dr. TANNER asked for some explanation of the provisions of the Bill.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said that a Memorandum in regard to the Bill had already been circulated. The Bill would impose no extra charge on the revenues of India, but tended to the contrary result. It applied to certain officials who belonged to the old East India Company, and who were under a special Superannuation Act passed in the reign of George III. There had been great difficulty in working the two superannuation funds, and it was thought right to try and amend the terms of the East India Company's Act. The result would be that the few gentlemen who were concerned would be able to retire at a somewhat earlier period at a less pension.

The Bill was then read a second time.

April 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR FAMINE RELIEF.

Mr. M. M. BROWNAGGER asked the Secretary of State for India what was the total amount of subscriptions received and remitted to India up to the end of March for the relief of the people suffering from famine by the United Kingdom, the British colonies, and the Russian dominions, for the money and grain contributions from which the thanks of her Majesty's Government were recently conveyed to the Government of the Czar.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: In reply to a telegram asking for information as to the sums already transmitted, the Government of India telegraphed on the 3rd instant the following statement:—Total subscriptions Indian Famine Fund as follows: Mansion House, £361,850, remainder of United Kingdom £185,400, British colonies £37,548, of which Canada £25,000; India £79,731, other parts of the world £4,732;

grand total \$867,256. They add that no contribution in money has as yet been received from Russia. What may have been received in kind I am at present unable to say; but her Majesty's Government, having learned that gifts of grain were on their way from Russia, and that the Russian Government had given special facilities for their transport, lost no time in causing their thanks to be conveyed to that Government for their sympathetic and liberal action. It will be observed that the sums of money received by the Government of India up to the 3rd instant were considerably less than the amount which is known to have been subscribed or promised, which cannot in all be less than about £787,500.

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

Colonel WYNDHAM MURRAY asked the Under Secretary of State for War, whether he would consider the advisability of carrying out the recommendation of the Committee of the Royal College of Physicians contained in their Report forwarded to the Secretary of State for India on the 29th March, that Medical Officers of the Army should give elementary reading-room lectures on the preservation of health to young soldiers:

And, whether these lectures could especially be given before or during their voyage to India.

Mr. BRIDGES: The recommendation that Medical Officers of the Army should give lectures to young soldiers on the preservation of their health is one to which great importance is attached, and the question of the time and manner in which such advice can be given is under consideration.

April 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Khan, Sulaimon.—Petition of Sulaimon Khan for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

April 8th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

Captain PIERCE asked the Secretary of State for India what steps, if any, had been taken to carry out the urgent recommendation of the Sanitary Commissioner with the Government in India, in his Report for 1894, which was also quoted with approval in the Report on Sanitary Measures in India in 1894-5, that much might be done to diminish the extent and severity of contagious diseases among the British troops in India by providing increased facilities for bathing with comfort and convenience in private and public baths, and by inculcating habits of personal cleanliness among the troops.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received a special report on the action taken on the representations made by the Sanitary Commissioner, but I understand that, in the opinion of the military authorities, ample provision is made for supplying British soldiers in India with the means of personal cleanliness. The importance of the matter is so well understood that it seems unnecessary to call for any special report.

April 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petition from Croydon, for further protection of British troops; to lie upon the Table.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

DISSATISFACTION AT RELIEF SYSTEM.

Mr. BAYNE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that dissatisfaction existed with the administration of the famine relief and the management of famine relief works in the district of Cuddapah in the Presidency of Madras:

And, whether he would cause to be published, or lay upon the Table of the House, the Reports recently addressed to the Government of Madras on the state of the district by the Famine Commissioner and the Sanitary Commissioner.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not aware that dissatisfaction exists with regard to the administration of relief in the Cuddapah district. The latest monthly relief report from Madras shows that at the end of January an area containing 284,000 inhabitants and amounting to about one-fifth of the district, was considered to be affected. On the 8th March 2,735 persons in this area were employed on relief works and 7,488 were receiving gratuitous relief. The unusually large proportion of people receiving gratuitous relief, which is attributed to the large "numbers of weavers relieved at their trade," warrants a belief that the administration of relief in Cuddapah is not illiberal.

All reports relating to the famine in Madras have been and will be included in the Famine papers presented periodically to Parliament while the Famine continues. I should add that the Governor is giving very close supervision to the administration of Famine relief within his Presidency.

THE FAMINE RELIEF FUND.

ALLEGED UNFAIR DISTRIBUTION.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the demand made by the Bengal Branch of the Famine Relief Fund on the Central Relief Fund for about one-third of the entire fund:

Whether he had information that out of 51½ lakhs already distributed 11 lakhs had been assigned to Bengal, while the North-West Provinces and Oudh had received 17 lakhs:

Whether, on the basis of proportionate distress, as revealed by the number of persons on relief works, the North-West Provinces and Oudh would be entitled to 51.45 per cent. of the total receipts, and Bengal to only 12.75:

And, whether he was in a position to exercise any influence over the administrators of the Central Fund to secure that it should be fairly and proportionately distributed.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I am not aware of the proportions in which the Famine Relief Fund has been allotted by the Central Committee between the various affected districts; but I know that the distribution is made after a careful consideration of their competing claims. I have also reason to believe that the Central Committee is in constant communication with the Government of India, and gladly accepts its advice and assistance. But I have no influence in the matter, nor does it appear to me to be possible or desirable for any person in this country to attempt to control the local administration of the Fund.

DELAY OF "GRAIN COMPENSATION."

Mr. BIGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could explain why it was that the allowance sanctioned from 1st November, 1896, as grain compensation to all Native employees (Government servants) in the famine-stricken districts, drawing 10 rupees per month and under, was not given to the recipients till the middle of March, 1897:

And, whether any Government department was especially responsible for this delay in distribution.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Grain compensation is sanctioned by the local Authorities, and the dates of such sanctions are not necessarily reported to the central Government, but I have sufficient information to enable me to say that in many cases the compensation was granted before the 1st November, 1896. As to the delay alleged to have taken place, by which the grant was postponed beyond the middle of March, 1897, I have no knowledge at present; but if the name of the district in question is supplied to me I will make enquiry.

JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES.

Mr. PICKERSGILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in some provinces of India the judicial branch of the Indian Civil Service was being encroached upon and its proper functions circumscribed by the appointment of revenue officers to perform judicial work; and that in some instances the trial of sessions cases had been transferred to district magistrates who presumably were without adequate judicial training:

And was this partial supersession of the provincial judiciary of India due to the exercise of the power given to the executive authorities under the amended Criminal Procedure Code to invest district magistrates and other revenue officers with judicial functions; and, if so, would inquiry be made as to the desirability of these provisions of the Code being revised or

restricted, so that the confidence of the people in the administration of justice might be maintained.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not aware that the judicial branch of the service is being encroached upon. It is true that local Governments in the non-regulation Provinces have the power of investing district magistrates with authority to try offences not punishable with death, but this power was not conferred by the amended Code; it has existed for 25 years, and I am not aware that it has been exercised more freely of late than at any former time, nor have I any reason to think that the existing law requires alteration.

OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION CHARGE.

With reference to the "East India Company's Officers' Superannuation [Charge]," the following resolution was considered in Committee, agreed to, and reported to the House:

That it is expedient to authorise the Charge on the Revenues of India of any addition to the Superannuation or Retiring Allowances, which may become payable under any Act of the present Session to remove doubts as to the power of the Secretary of State in Council of India to grant Superannuation and Compensation Allowances in certain cases to Officers on his Establishment.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.]

VOL. VIII.

Parliamentary Report No. 5.

JUNE, 1897.

This Supplement consists of a FULL Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from April 26th to May 20th.

Imperial Parliament.

April 26th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

State of Kythul,—Petition from Bulham, for enquiry: to lie upon the Table.

• REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS' FUND.

The following resolution was reported to the House and agreed to:

"That it is expedient to authorise the Secretary of State in Council of India to contribute, out of the revenues of India, such sums as may be required to meet certain liabilities under any Act of the present Session to make provision for the transfer of the assets, liabilities and management of the Regular Widows' Fund and of the Elders' Widows' Fund to the Secretary of State in Council of India."

The Regular and Elders' Widows' Funds Bill was then considered in Committee (Mr. J. Grant Lawson in the Chair), reported without amendment, read a third time and passed.

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPER-ANNUATION.

The following Resolution was reported to the House and agreed to:

"That it is expedient to authorise the charge on the revenues of India of any addition to the Superannuation or Retiring Allowances, which may become payable under any Act of the present Session to remove doubts as to the power of the Secretary of State in Council of India to grant Superannuation and Compensation Allowances in certain cases to officers on his establishment."

The East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill was then considered in Committee, and reported without Amendment.

April 27th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL LIST.

Mr. HERWOOD JOHNSTON rose to call attention to the grievance of the officers of the General List (Indian Army) in the matter of their pensions, and to move: "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the grievances of the officers on the general list of the Indian army in the matter of

their succession to colonels' allowances, and to report to the House thereon." He pointed out that the officers felt that they had a real grievance to complain of, and that there was no tribunal to which they could appeal except the House of Commons. He could not conceive why it was that the Government, who were so ready to refer every controversial question to the consideration of a Committee or a Royal Commission, should have hesitated to refer this matter to a Committee. The Government had been very prolific in appointing Committees and Royal Commissions. These officers felt that they had a legitimate grievance, and the question was of serious importance to them, because it represented a loss of something like £400 a year. They claimed that they were entitled to colonels' allowances. It was felt by them also to be a hardship that officers who were their juniors in the service should have the advantage of the privileges which were denied to them. One case had been brought to his notice in which an officer who had served in command of a regiment did not receive his colonel's allowance, while his second in command, and actually his junior in entering the service, did. These were officers who joined the service between 1859 and 1861 and were nominated under the old conditions of things by the directors of the East India Company. Everyone joined under the same conditions as the officers of the East India Company's service. They were appointed by the directors; they paid their passage out to India, and they had to this day to subscribe to the old East India Company's funds, established for the relief of the widows and orphans. At the time when these officers were nominated their future position was uncertain. The Mutiny was scarcely at an end, and there was a question in the minds of the authorities at home as to what would be the future of the East India Company's service. When nominated, each officer was asked to sign a paper which contained, among other questions: "Have you been informed that all the appointments now made are to be subject to any alterations that may be decided on?" He thought the last words were of considerable importance in estimating the position of the officers at the present day. What was the position of affairs at that time? First, considerable variations had been introduced in the wording of that question from time to time when it came under the consideration of the India Office. It stood there simply "subject to any alteration that may be decided on," but the India Office, in considering these claims, had more than once altered the phraseology, turning the question into one asking these gentlemen if they accepted their appointments "subject to any alteration which may be subsequently made in the condition of their service." The explanation was perfectly plain and simple. It was to be found in a dispatch written by the Secretary of State for India to the Viceroy on September 30th, 1859, in which a communication was made in reference to the probability of some change being made in the constitution of the Indian army. It was decided in December following by the Government that all future appointments

should be made "subject to any alteration that may be decided on." This showed the reason and the intention of putting the question to those gentlemen who had been appointed. A Royal Commission was sitting at that time to decide on the future position of the officers, and on what lines the Indian forces should be reorganised. He contended that the words "decided on" imported a conclusion of the matter at the moment under consideration. It was not subject to any alteration hereafter: it was subject to any alteration which might be decided on. He suggested that the House must lay weight on the word "decided," and the answer to that was to be found in the Royal Commission which was sitting to decide on the future of the Indian army. The Henley Clause gave particular privileges and rights to those who had served in the forces of the East India Company; but, while the officers did not base their claim on that clause, or on the fact that as cadets they were appointed as officers of the East India Company, they did base their case on the fact that they were officers of the Indian army. The Henley Clause stated (21 and 22 Vic. c. 106, 1858) that the officers were "to be entitled to the like pay, pension allowances and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise as if they had continued in the service of the Company." Then, according to section 87 of the same clause, it was "lawful for her Majesty, by Order in Council, to alter or regulate the terms and conditions of service under which persons hereafter entering her Majesty's Indian forces shall be commissioned." Any Order in Council was to be laid before Parliament; but he had searched, and he did not believe any such Order could be found which purported to alter the conditions of the service under which these gentlemen joined. They were officers of the Indian army, and as such were entitled to those rights and privileges which had since been taken away. There was a distinction between the Honourable East India Company's Service and the Indian Army. A great deal of the confusion which had attended the consideration of this particular question was due to the fact that no sufficient distinction had been drawn between the officers of the East India Company's Service and those who belonged to the Indian Army. The officers for whom he was speaking claimed—and claimed rightly—to be officers of the Indian Army. That they were entitled to that position was made sufficiently clear by the Governor-General's Order of 1861. When these officers arrived in India the condition of things was an uncertain one. It was not known what their future was to be. But the result of this Royal Commission was practically that the Indian Army was split up into three divisions. There was the local list, comprising those who opted to serve in the local forces in India; there was the general list, comprising those who volunteered for the general service of the Crown; and there was the Staff Corps, created for the first time, of which every officer who had since joined the Indian Army had been a member. All the officers who belonged to the East India Company's Service were given the right of choosing to which of these services they would belong. The Governor-General's Order, No. 960, of 1861, said: "According to the declaration made by these young officers, they have no choice, but the option may be given them, in common with other young officers of the Indian Army, to volunteer for general or local service or for Staff Corps." He laid stress on the words "in common with other young officers of the Indian Army," because those words clearly indicated that they were officers of the Indian Army, and this option was given to them in common with other young officers of the Indian Army, to volunteer for general or local service or for the Staff Corps. They volunteered for the local service. In a despatch dated July 31, 1862, Sir Charles Wood, the then Secretary of State, dealt with the whole question. Apparently the Government of Bombay had recommended that each Lieutenant-Colonel should be promoted to a colonelcy, and receive a colonel's allowance after the expiration of ten years. Sir C. Wood decided that, "All officers who may have held the rank of Lieut.-colonel on January 1, 1862, will also be entitled to promotion to the superior grade of colonel, with colonel's allowances, if the step come to them in the ordinary course, before the completion of 12 years' service as Lieut.-colonel; but when these Lieut.-colonels have been removed from the lists the promotion of those whose Commissions bear date on January 1, 1862, or subsequently, will only be made, as in the

Staff Corps, after 12 years' service in that grade." Here it was clearly laid down that those officers who attained the rank of Lieut.-colonel after January 1st, 1862, would be entitled to a colonel's allowances after 12 years' service as Lieut.-colonel. In this despatch Sir C. Wood also said: "The principle upon which the succession to colonel's allowances of officers of the Indian army who have not joined the Staff Corps or the new Line Regiments is to be hereafter regulated, is to be considered as determined by this arrangement." Here, then, they had this 12 years' arrangement clearly laid down, and it was expressly stated that the principle upon which the succession of these gentlemen to colonels' allowances was to be regulated was to be considered as determined by this arrangement. He did not know whether the India Office proposed to rest their case upon the ground that these gentlemen were not officers of the Indian army. If that was their intention he would refer them to the official Army List for this year, where they would find the names of those gentlemen under the head of "Indian Army, General List." The next despatch to which he would call attention was the despatch of June 17, 1864, written by Sir C. Wood to the Governor-General of India. It began by saying that "it was also considered desirable, on general grounds, to remove, as far as possible, all distinctions between the officers of her Majesty's general and Indian armies, and to form them prospectively into one united body, retaining for the Indian officers in the meantime such advantages as were peculiar to their service." Here it should be observed the distinction was drawn between the Indian officers and the general officers, in other words, between those on the local list and those on the general list. The distinction drawn was not between officers of the East India Company and the officers of the "Indian Army." Sir C. Wood went on to say: "It might perhaps have prevented a good deal of misunderstanding if the measures for these various objects, which were distinct in themselves, had been undertaken separately, but so much was inevitable, and it was so desirable that the full extent of any changes should be known at once, and that men's minds should not be left in uncertainty as to their future condition, that it was determined to carry into effect, without loss of time, all the measures required for the changes which were to be made." Those were grave and serious words, and the men who read that despatch, and determined their future careers on the wording of that despatch were entitled to rely upon it. In view of that declaration, it passed belief that in 1882 a new and further change would be made wholly to their disadvantage. In the 19th paragraph of the despatch the Secretary of State said: "It appears that of the officers of the Indian army who joined the line regiments the whole of the artillery and engineers, and those who joined the staff corps, have been generally benefited by the change." Then came the words: "If to this number be added the whole of the officers who entered the Service since 1858 on conditions subject to any change that might be introduced into the service, it will be seen that there will remain a comparatively small number who can have any real cause of complaint," showing clearly that these officers (for there were no others to whom this description would apply) were to be "benefited by the change." A subsequent paragraph of the despatch ran: "The general promotion of the Indian officers will be accelerated, and to every officer, including the cadet who entered the service so lately as December, 1861, his promotion through every grade, with the pay thereunto belonging, as if the whole native army of India had been kept up, is assured, and his right to Indian pension is maintained." These extracts showed what assurances were given to the officers on the general list of the Indian army, to whom alone they were applicable. In another paragraph these words occurred: "Nor is it probable that more than a very few cases can occur in which an officer will not attain the colonel's allowance after a shorter total period of service, even though he may remain rather longer in the grade of Lieut.-colonel." Then the 31st paragraph stated: "With this measure the arrangements as regards the officers of the Indian army will be closed. The advantages which have been conferred upon the majority of those officers have already been pointed out, and it cannot be doubted that under the system now established the officers of the Indian army will, for the most part, attain to the several regimental grades, including that of colonel, with colonel's allowances, in a shorter period of service than they would have done had the several staff corps not been formed and had no change in the constitution of the Indian army taken place."

He did not think a more explicit pledge could be given to any body of men than that which was given in the despatch of 1864 from which he had read. That that was the view taken by the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton was clear from an answer the right hon. gentleman gave to a question put by Sir Richard Temple in 1885 on this subject. The right hon. gentleman said: "The passage in the order of 1864 refers to the prospects of promotion and pension under the rules then in force, including the succession to the colonel's allowance; but as regards the officers who entered the service since 1868, this promise is subject to any change that might be introduced into the service." The House would see that the right hon. gentleman distinctly called it a promise—(hear, hear.)—a promise that these officers should have the right of succession to the colonel's allowance after twelve years' service as lieutenant-colonel. He now came to the last Act. The House would hardly believe that eighteen years afterwards, in 1882, although in the meanwhile entrance into the staff corps had been closed to these gentlemen, entrance into which would have secured to them this allowance, they were told that, instead of getting their rights after they had served twelve years as lieutenant-colonel, they were to be put on a pension of £750 a year, which meant a clear and absolute loss to them of nearly £400 a year. Thus, these particular gentlemen had been singled out from among all those serving in Her Majesty's Indian army for this treatment. After relying on the promise given in the despatch of 1864, and after having done good service for Her Majesty, they were told that, instead of being entitled after twelve years' service as lieutenant-colonel to the colonel's allowance, they were reduced to a pension of £750 a year, and were told to be thankful for that. He need hardly say that he had no personal interest in the case of these gentlemen. (Hear, hear.) He had taken it up as a matter of duty. He had been exercised in his mind to see what possible answer could be made to the claims of these gentlemen. Of course, he was well aware that the Government had always the power to deal with those in their service as they pleased; but power was one thing and right was another—(hear, hear.)—and he did not propose to discuss the question from the basis of what it was in the power of the Government to do, but from the basis of what was the right and honest thing to do. He believed that considerable reliance was placed on the declaration which these gentlemen had signed, but there could be no question that all the subsequent alterations and emendations did not exist in the original answer received. Then, again, the question had sometimes been raised that these gentlemen were not officers in the Indian army, but to this day their names appeared in the official Army List as such, so that ground of objection disappeared. Again, it had sometimes been repeated in the voluminous correspondence on the subject that these officers were better off than they might have expected to be; but they had not got what had been promised to them, and they were not so well off as they had a right to expect. The probability of succession to the colonel's allowance had been considered by a Committee, whose finding was embodied in a despatch, and he found that that Committee reported that the twelve years' term was two years in excess of the fair term, the average of which had been a little over ten years; so that these officers might fairly have expected to get their colonel's allowance after ten years' service as lieutenant-colonel. (Hear, hear.) Then, finally, they were told that the assurance given in the despatch of 1864 had been fulfilled. These gentlemen would not be asking the House to consider their case that day if that assurance had been fulfilled, and he believed it would pass the ingenuity of the noble lord to make out that it had been fulfilled in any shape or form. (Hear, hear.) He had not elaborated the case as he might have done. He had felt it his duty to put it as shortly, and he hoped as intelligibly, as he possibly could before the House. What he was asking for was not a decision of the House on the claims of these gentlemen, but that they might be referred to the impartial judgment of a Select Committee, and he failed to see why Her Majesty's Government should refuse that. The Government seemed to have made it a Government matter, and had issued a Whip of four lines against it. He had always thought that there was a lack of the sense of proportion in those who were responsible for Government Whips. A Whip of three lines only was issued on the Necessitous Board Schools Bill, and that showed the comparative importance which the Government attached to a measure like that, and the investigation of the conduct of a department of the Government for which they themselves, as

a Government, could not be in any shape or form responsible. (Hear, hear.) The Government had shut the door against anything like enquiry into this question, and had made it a Government matter. There was a passage in *Miscellany's Essay on Lord Olive* to the effect that the strength and foundation of British rule in India was that the Nappy, however humble and poor he might be, felt that under the rule of the Company his bread and salt were secured to him, however long he might live. If that was so with the Indian soldier, should it be less so with the English officer, who had led him in many hard-fought and difficult engagements? (Hear, hear.) That was the view taken in early days under the Honourable East India Company, and now it was found in contrast to that that no enquiry could be made into the manner in which the India Office from time to time had treated these men who had served them so well. He could imagine but one thing more damaging to a Government than an accusation that they had treated harshly and unfairly those who had done good service in years past. (Hear, hear.) To such an accusation any Government might be exposed, and no harm was done; but when those who had an opportunity of having such an accusation honestly and fairly enquired into turned away from it and endeavoured by all the means at the disposal of a Government to shut the door against enquiry into it, only one conclusion could be drawn. (Hear, hear.) He felt that this ought never to have been made a Government matter. He felt that these gentlemen had a strong and legitimate grievance, and he would, therefore, conclude by moving the resolution which stood in his name. (Hear, hear.)

Sir SARGENT KING, in seconding the resolution, asked for the indulgence of the House if he traversed over again some of the ground covered by his hon. friend; but this grievance of officers in the general list was so intricate in itself, and depended so much on the interpretations of warrants and despatches, that he was bound to trespass on the patience of the House to a certain extent, and to ask for the indulgence hon. members were always ready to give. The right hon. gentleman the member for Cambridge University, who dealt with this matter as Under-Secretary for India on a former occasion, stated, in opening the case for the Government, that he believed the subject was one which hardly anyone understood, and which no one could solve. He could only say for himself that for years he had studied this question, and the more he studied it the more difficult and the less clear it seemed. He agreed with his hon. friend that it was next to impossible to thoroughly make the subject clear to members of the House except through the medium of a Select Committee. That was why they appealed for a Select Committee. He knew his noble friend would say that he was quite able to put before the House how they ought to vote on this question, but all he could say to his noble friend and the House was this—if they could make out a *prima facie* case for an enquiry, they were entitled to it. (Hear, hear.) He thought that his hon. friend had made out such a case. Now, what would his noble friend say? He would say that he was advised by his departmental advisers that these gentlemen had no case; but most people who had gone into the facts, as he had conscientiously done, were convinced that they had an excellent case. He thought that that was the interpretation placed on these warrants and despatches. Of course, he did not blame his noble friend for the attitude which he assumed; he was more or less at the mercy of his military advisers, but if his noble friend said that he was only taking the same view which had been taken by every other Secretary of State, he could only reply that that was one more reason why they should come to that House. What was the good of arraigning the officials before the Secretary of State? Why, his noble friend was their mere mouthpiece in that House. He said, on behalf of those whose cause he advocated, that they were willing to trust the House of Commons, and if it was satisfied, after enquiry, that they had no case, they would abide by that decision. As matters stood, the only appeal they had was to people who had already prejudged their claims. He had, as he said—and the House would believe him—gone very carefully and honestly into the facts, and he had endeavoured to understand this question, and, looking at it impartially, he had come to the conclusion that there was a legitimate claim on the Indian Government. These officers had rendered their services when India was passing through its most critical moments, and now these allowances were not to be granted. The hon. member proceeded to read a number

of extracts from orders and despatches bearing on the claims of the officers, and urged that the whole circumstances called for investigation. Certainly, those gentlemen were no more entitled to the privilege than the gentlemen whose case he was advocating to-day. There was only one more extract he would quote, and that was from the statement of the Military Secretary. That official said: "The general list officers were appointed to the Indian Army subject to any alterations in the conditions of service which might hereafter be determined on." He asked hon. members to mark the wording of that sentence—"the conditions of service which might hereafter be determined on." As his hon. friend had pointed out, there was not one syllable about "hereafter" in the original. What was said in the despatch confirming the form of declaration was that they were to be subject to any alteration in the conditions of the service, meaning, of course, the whole Indian army, and meaning the alterations then being considered by the Royal Commission sitting on the reorganisation of the army. In 1858 the exact wording was: "All future appointments of cadets should be made subject to any alteration that may be decided upon." Why? Because a Royal Commission was sitting. What alterations were contemplated? Alterations suggested by the Royal Commission. When, therefore, the cadets agreed to abide by any alterations that might be decided upon, it was quite clear they agreed only to the alterations to be made by the Royal Commission. Yet it was now pretended that this "declaration," this agreement, not only debarred the general list officers from the advantages which the General Order of 1864 "assured" and "maintained" to them in common with all officers of the Indian army, but bound them to accept "any alterations in the conditions of service which might thereafter be determined upon." The words of the General Order of 1864, which was an honest and straightforward document, described the general list officers as officers who entered the service on "conditions subject to any change that might be introduced into the service." It did not say "might or may hereafter be introduced." Such were the weapons which the India Office placed in his noble friend's hands, and he had no doubt the noble lord would make the best use of them. He dared say the noble lord would trot out again the question of expense, but he would undertake to prove, if a commission were appointed, that the expense would be very small indeed. Of course, his noble friend would trot out numerous figures to contradict him, but that, again, would be obvious proof that this was not the place to decide such a question. It was not across the floor of the House of Commons that this question could be settled. What was wanted was some small independent tribunal. He could not understand why his noble friend resisted the suggestion made, unless there was something they knew nothing of in the background, and that he could not believe for one moment. There was no doubt his noble friend did betray great mistrust of the House of Commons, and perhaps he was wise in doing so, but that mistrust was the strongest evidence of the strength of their case. The noble lord was afraid to let the case go before a Committee, because he knew what the decision of a Committee would be; he knew that justice would be done there. What was the course the noble lord had pursued? He had not left them free and unfettered to decide this matter, a matter which was purely administrative and in which party obligation was in no way at stake. He had seen a good many four-line Whips, but he had never known such a Whip issued in order to enable a department to avoid a free enquiry. He asked the noble lord to remember that if it was excellent to have a giant's strength it was tyranny to use it like a giant. It was unworthy to invoke the aid of a big majority in jockeying fifty-eight poor officers out of their rights. Just as he would refuse to be dictated to on a question like this, he hoped and believed there were many members of the House who would not listen to the Front Bench, whether it was occupied by members of this or that party. Both Front Benches were tarred with the same brush; the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton was just as bad as the noble lord. They all knew that whichever side was in there was no justice to be got out of a man when once he got on to the Front Bench. Let him end as he began. They had not the slightest fear of the House of Commons. They asked for justice. They did not ask hon. members to pronounce any opinion on the merits of the case. They simply asked to be allowed to go before an impartial tribunal, and not to have their case decided by a packed jury, as it were. Before such a

tribunal he undertook to prove their case up to the hilt. (Hear, hear.)

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said the hon. member for Horsham had made a very able speech, but he very naturally based it on information supplied to him. He did not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman when he was wrong; indeed, had he done so, it would have been necessary to interpolate a correction at every sentence. He thought he would be able to show, in the course of his remarks, that there never was a weaker case put before the House of Commons than the present. But before he dealt with the question of the appointment of a Committee, he desired to say there were certain sentiments enunciated by his hon. friend with which he entirely agreed. He agreed that the Government were bound to keep faith with those they employed. He further agreed that the Government had no right whatever to wriggle out of an engagement by the ambiguity of the language employed; but, after all, the Indian Exchequer and the Indian taxpayer had their rights just as much as anybody else. What was the object of the appointment of a Select Committee? It was to reverse the decision of successive Viceroys, of successive Commanders-in-chief, of successive Secretaries of State, and of every military and civil member of their respective Councils for the last 16 years. There was an absolutely unbroken record of authority against this case, and it must be remembered that military opinion dominated the Indian Government to a greater degree than it did any other administration in her Majesty's dominions. It was a matter of notoriety that the arrangements made by the Indian Government in connection with these servants were far more generous and liberal than those sanctioned by this House or the Treasury, and, therefore, a very strong case must be made out before the House would attempt to interfere with the Indian Government, and put upon the Indian revenue a charge which the Indian Government considered injustice. What was the case which his hon. friends had presented? It was that these officers had been robbed—the hon. member for Hull used the word jockeyed—out of their right to colonels' allowances. But these officers were allowed colonels' allowances; they were entitled to a certain establishment of colonels' allowances. The number of colonels' allowances to which this particular branch of the service was entitled was 13. These officers claimed that they had a unlimited right to colonels' allowances, but the East India Company in the past, and the Queen's Government since, had always put a limitation on the number of colonels' allowances, with one single exception. What had made this case complicated was that a number of facts wholly extraneous to the case had been dragged in in order to give colour to it. There were two sets of facts kept entirely distinct. The first related to the reform and reorganisation of the Indian army after the Mutiny, and the second related to those officers who joined the Indian army subsequent to the date of the transfer of authority. He thought he would be able to make it clear that both his hon. friends had been misled in the statements they had made. The Indian Mutiny was a terrible Imperial disaster, but it was largely caused by the defective military organisation of the native army in India. It was, therefore, self-evident that as soon as the powers of the East India Company were transferred to the Crown, the first duty of the Crown would be thoroughly to reorganise the native army. Great sympathy was felt with the European officers of the Company, many of whom had died at their posts during the Mutiny, and the rapid rehabilitation of British influence in India was largely due to their skill and valour. There was a strong feeling in the House of Commons that when the transference of powers took place these officers should not be prejudiced by the change. While the Bill was before Parliament a Committee was formed for the protection of the interests of these officers, and the Committee entered into various negotiations with the Government for the insertion of words, and ultimately certain words contained in the well-known "Henley clause" were agreed to. Those words were extremely wide, and were such as no Parliament nowadays would assent to: It was laid down that "These officers shall be under the same obligation to serve Her Majesty as they would have been to serve under the said Company, and shall be liable to serve within the same territorial limits only . . . and shall be entitled to like pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion as if they had continued in the service of the said Company." Those words applied to the old East India officers alone. They were purely retrospective in their

action, and a subsequent clause was inserted applying to all the officers who came in afterwards: "It shall be lawful for Her Majesty from time to time, by an Order in Council, to alter or regulate the terms and conditions of service under which persons hereafter entering Her Majesty's Indian forces shall be commissioned." There were, therefore, two sections in the Act. Under the one came all the old East India Company's officers, and under the other came all those who joined subsequently to 1858. What his hon. friend wished to do was to transfer the officers under the latter section to the former. If that proposal were assented to, he must say distinctly that it would be a gross breach of faith with the Indian Government, on whom this Henley clause had placed a tremendous obligation. In the work of reorganising the Indian Army, this Henley clause was a millstone round the neck of the Indian Government. They could not move in any direction without coming into contact with the guaranteed interests of the old officers. In the old days the army was organised under a system analogous to that in this country, and promotion was strictly by regimental seniority. To every regiment were attached somewhat less than thirty officers, on the average; and to every battalion was apportioned one colonel's allowance and no more. After the Indian Mutiny half the battalions disappeared. Various Commissions reported in favour of reductions, and the army was reduced from 250,000 to 120,000 men. An entirely different system of officering was also introduced—the irregular system, first applied to the cavalry and then to the infantry—under which the number of officers attached to a regiment was reduced to less than one-fourth of the old number. And yet the Indian Government had to give to every single officer the same pay, allowances, and promotion as would have existed if the old system had continued. Commission after Commission was appointed to see that the terms of the Henley clause were complied with, and concession after concession was made to meet the difficulty. The first of these concessions took the form of the Order, read out by the hon. member, giving colonels' allowances after ten years' service as full lieutenant-colonel. That Order applied only to the officers of the old East India Company, and was in no sense applicable to the officers whose case was brought forward by his hon. friend. In 1866, when the present Prime Minister was Secretary of State for India, a further Commission had reported that, notwithstanding all the concessions made, the guarantee clause had not been fulfilled as regarded the colonels' allowances to the old officers, and, in despair the Government made a tremendous concession to those officers. In order to have a free hand in future in dealing with all these military problems, on which the security of India depended, it was necessary to buy out all these officers; and the Government allowed them to come in to the Staff Corps, and after twelve years' service to obtain colonels' allowances without regard to the number on the list. Now his hon. friend wished to apply those terms to the officers who had joined subsequently to 1858. Every military authority admitted that from the laxity of wording in the Henley clause the reorganisation of the Indian Army had cost India millions more than would otherwise have been necessary; and Parliament ought to be very careful before adding to the already heavy non-effective charges of the Indian Army. As to the officers whose case had been brought forward by his hon. friend, every one of those officers joined subsequently to the termination of the powers of the East India Company.

MR. HERWOOD JOHNSTONE: If my right hon. friend will pardon me, I have the names here of the Directors who nominated them.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said that he thought his hon. friend had fallen into error. What occurred was that the whole of the powers of the Board of Directors ceased, and were transferred to the Secretary of State in Council. But a certain number of the directors were on the Council, where, however, they no longer acted as directors. So careful were the Indian Government, that they put under the Henley clause all the officers who up to that time had been nominated by the East India Company, but who had not actually joined the Service. His hon. friend had referred to the Report of the Commission appointed to enquire into the terms under which those officers should serve. His hon. friend must know that that Commission laid down that all these officers came in under the new conditions. It was idle to pretend now that they did not know they were coming in under the new conditions.

They went out to India, and were put on the general list; but in 1861, after two years, the reforms in the Indian army had so far established themselves that certain alternatives of service were offered to these young men. They might join the white regiments, which had been transferred from the Company to the Crown, taking with them the Indian pensions, but having no claim to colonels' allowances, or they might join the Staff Corps—a service which had been instituted for the purpose of officering the irregular system. In that corps the promotion was regulated by length of service, and the officers were entitled to colonels' allowances at the ratio of 1 to 30—the old ratio under the Company. Some of the officers selected the one Service and some another. Between 1861 and 1866 every officer on the general list—all those whose claims were advocated by his hon. friend—could have joined the Staff Corps; but all did not, because they got better terms by remaining on the general list. When this tremendous concession was made in 1866, officers were requested to join the Staff Corps before a certain day. Having done that, they were entitled, after a certain term of service, to full colonels' allowances. There were a certain number of officers of the general list and British regiments who came in subsequently to 1861 and before 1866, and the question which the Indian Government had to consider was whether this exceptional privilege should be extended to those officers. For the purposes of uniformity, and to avoid having to deal with men on the same list in different ways, that concession was extended to the limited number of these men in the Staff Corps; but, with that exception, the ratio maintained had always been that of 1 to 30. His hon. friend talked about robbery. The facts showed how groundless was that charge. Under the order of 1864 the old rates of pensions were, after twenty years' service, £191, which was raised by the new order of 1862 to £250; after twenty-four years' service £202, raised to £365; after twenty-eight years' service £365, raised to £500; after thirty-two years' service £450, raised to £700; and after thirty-eight years' service £456, raised to £700. With the fullest desire to do justice, he had looked carefully into this matter, and he had found an absolutely unbroken record of official opinion against the claims put forward on behalf of those officers. But he was desirous, before coming to a final conclusion, to consult an authority higher than a Committee of the House of Commons—he meant the Military Committee of India, consisting of Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart, Sir Archibald Alison, and General Gordon; and he asked them to look into the matter, with the result that they had reported against the claims of those officers. It was said that this was a small matter, that there were only a few officers concerned; but if the House appointed a Committee to investigate the conditions under which those officers had enlisted, they would have to enquire into the cases not only of those on the effective list, but of those who had retired from the effective list in the belief that the decisions of the Secretary of State were final. He would ask, Would this claim be granted if it were to apply to English revenues? (Hear, hear.) It seemed to him it was a claim that the House could not possibly assent to. At the present moment there was great sympathy with the Indian Government, and proposals had been made from both sides of the House that assistance should be given to the Indian exchequer to enable them to tide over the temporary difficulties against which they were now contending. He did not think that they needed that assistance. He believed the Indian Government would manage to struggle on, provided they got fair play and were protected from motions of this kind, which he was sure would not be moved if they were to apply to the English taxpayer. (Hear, hear.) He undertook that there should be a complete fulfilment of any contract or engagement made by the Indian Government in regard to those officers, and he would take care that the Indian Government did not get the advantage of any ambiguity of phraseology in those contracts or engagements. Therefore, he thought he had the right to ask the House to protect the Indian Government from this motion, which he should characterise as one of the most unjustifiable that they had ever been subjected to.

SIR JAMES FRERGUSON said that, as he had served for some years in the army, as he had been Under-Secretary for India in 1866, when the Commission was appointed, and as his services in the army in India had given him considerable knowledge of the position and claims of the officers in question, he desired to say a few words on the motion before the House. No doubt, upon the Paper circulated those officers had a certain case; but the

statements made in those Papers must be read with their context. He thought the Secunder of the Motion had put his case on too high a ground. It was not necessary to accuse the members of the Government and the successive officials who had borne the responsibility of administering the affairs of India, of having robbed those officers. Strong expressions of that kind were only resorted to when there was a weak case. To say that when men obtained places on the Treasury Bench they lost all sense of right and wrong was ridiculous. At any rate he, having sat on the Treasury Bench, had not been sensible of having had any such loss. He, for his part, thought that the officers of the old East India Company were treated with great liberality. If any error had been committed at all, it was an error of liberality. But if the letter of the law held out the promise of expectation to those officers that they would be entitled to the succession of colonel's allowances when they had reached thirty-eight years' service, they ought to have those allowances. He could not get over the statement put forward by these officers themselves. They were asked whether all appointments now made were to be subject to any alteration that might be decided on. His hon. friends who moved and seconded the motion said that that did not cover the alterations in the conditions of pay and service generally. There was as great an assumption on the one side as on the other. He had looked into this question as long ago as 1866, and he thought then, as he had thought ever since, that it did leave the Government of India free to make such conditions for these officers' services, after they had organised the service of the army, as seemed proper to them. He did not think a *prima facie* case had been made out for an enquiry by Select Committee, and a Select Committee of that House ought not to be appointed unless such a *prima facie* case was made out. (Hear, hear.)

General RUSSELL said a good many of his constituents believed that a grievance existed. These officers did not wish to have their case prejudged; what they wished was to put the matter before an impartial tribunal. The noble lord seemed to have jumped to the conclusion that this Commission was going to report against him, and talked about the burden which would be cast on the finances of India. The whole question appeared to him to be a very difficult one, and he did not intend to enter into it, but what he did contend was that these officers were entitled to have their case examined by an impartial and entirely unbiassed tribunal. (Hear, hear.) Secretaries of State for India had always taken their advice and been coached by officers of a rival corps, the Staff Corps. They all knew that these rivalries and jealousies existed in all services, in the army, the navy, and even, he was told, in the Church. These unfortunate officers could control no votes, but they had passed their lives in India and served their country gallantly, and therefore he hoped that hon. members would vote for this impartial enquiry by a Committee of the House of Commons.

Sir HENRY FOWLER said he felt bound to intervene on two grounds. He wished to express his entire approval of the policy which was being pursued by the noble lord, as well as his admiration for the masterly speech which he had addressed to the House on that occasion. (Hear, hear.) He must also say a word or two on the speech of the hon. member for Hull, who seconded this motion. He did not think that speech ought to pass unnoticed. He had always demurred in that House to reflections being made on the Government of India, especially when they were groundless. In this country we understood the criticisms which opposing political parties passed upon each other, and upon Ministers, with reference to party politics. But when a responsible member of that House, and especially a member occupying the position relating to India which the member for Hull did, distinctly told the House of Commons and the people of this country that the Government of India, as represented in that House by those Ministers whom her Majesty had been pleased to appoint Secretary of State for India, were absolutely devoid of impartiality, that they prejudged every case that came before them, that they were entirely in the hands of their military officials, that if they objected to an enquiry there was something in the background, and that they had jockeyed officers out of their just claims, he could only say that that long catalogue of charges against responsible Ministers in that House was one which he was not anxious to see reprinted in the press of India. He felt that it was his duty to enter a strong protest against applying that language to the present Government or to their predecessors, or to the Government of the Viceroy in India, or to

the Indian Council in Whitehall—(hear, hear)—for they were all involved in the sweeping criticisms of the hon. member.

Sir H. SARGENT KYLE said he did not intend to convey anything of the kind. He had listened with utter amazement to the right hon. gentleman. On the contrary, he had said that the right hon. gentleman and his noble friend had come to a decision which they believed to be perfectly accurate. He himself, however, honestly took the view that the matter should be submitted to an impartial tribunal.

Sir H. FOWLER said he was quite willing to believe that his hon. friend did not intend to convey what he said, but he had quoted verbatim the words which had been used. He demurred altogether to the statement that this matter had been prejudged. He believed it had been investigated by five Secretaries of State—the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Kimberley, Lord Cross, the noble lord opposite, and himself. The hon. member stated that he approached this question with impartiality and with a conscientious desire to do his duty. Did the hon. member suppose that Secretaries of State were incapable of impartiality, or were devoid of conscience or regard for duty? He did not think the hon. member meant that, but unfortunately he implied it, and he, therefore, wished to enter his protest. After the clear statement of the noble lord, he was not going into the merits; he would only recall to the House what was the crux of the situation. The same advantages were asked for by officers who had joined the service after the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown as was granted by the Act of 1858 to the old East Indian army by the East Indian Government. The hon. and gallant member who had just sat down said that there was a rivalry between the Staff Corps and other branches of the service, but these gentlemen got all that the Staff Corps got, and were put in precisely the same position. He disagreed totally with the construction which had been put upon the dispatch of 1864, but the real point on which the controversy rested was whether these officers were entitled under that dispatch to what, with all respect to the present Prime Minister, he would venture to call the disastrous concession subsequently made in 1866, by which colonel's allowances were given to the whole of the officers who were in the old East India Company's service. His opinion was that if the Indian Government had been disposed to press the point they might have been able to deprive the officers on the general list of any colonel's allowances, but they had been given an establishment of 13. So far as his knowledge extended, he considered the Indian Government had always treated their servants with the simplest generosity, and he thought they were treated with special liberality in 1882. There had been, he might almost say, a dozen enquiries, and the matter had been fully and carefully considered, and if the House appointed a Select Committee to enquire further into it, it would avowedly be a declaration of opinion on the part of the House that injustice had been done, and that the case had not been properly investigated. In the event of the Committee reporting in favour of granting these allowances, the House would find itself in a difficult position, for the Government of India was the sole judge of the charges that were to be imposed on the revenues of India. The Secretary of State had but one vote in the Council, and that House had by standing orders adapted to the case of East Indian expenditure the same rule as existed with reference to Imperial expenditure—namely, that no proposal could be made for any charge upon the revenues of this country or of India unless it was previously recommended by the Crown—in other words, by the Government of the day. He thought that groundless charges had been made against the Government of India with reference to their expenditure; but it would be a very heavy additional charge if this application was granted, for the noble lord was quite right in saying that they would have to open the case of every man who had retired and taken a pension. He thought it would be a serious thing if the House of Commons, in spite of the deliberate opinion of the Viceroy and his Council, in spite of the deliberate opinion of five or six Secretaries of State and their Councils, recommended a charge on the revenues of India which every one of those authorities thought ought not to be put upon them, and a burden they should not be called upon to bear. As far as the military question was concerned, surely the hon. member would not impute to three such distinguished officers as Sir Donald Stewart, Sir Archibald Alison, and General Gordon any jealous rivalries, or a desire to do injustice to any part of the military service. They would be the first to recognise even

shadowy claims, if they rested on justice. In the face of their advice, not only to the Secretary of State, but to the Government of the day, and with all respect to the House of Commons, he thought it would be an unwise thing for the House to take a step indicating a desire to reverse the policy which had been pursued, and implying that the Government, both in India and at home, had been influenced by improper motives, or had prejudged the case, had not acted impartially, and had not done what he himself knew they intended to do, and what the Secretary for India, speaking quite as much for the Opposition side of the House as for his own, said that the Government would always do—whatever was fair and just to the distinguished men who, whether in a civil or military capacity, had served the Crown in the Government of India. (Cheers.)

The House divided upon Mr. Heywood Johnstone's motion, when the figures were:—

For the motion	55
Against	174
Majority against	119

April 29th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

On the motion of Sir H. H. Fowler a Return was granted for "Copy of the Indian Financial Statement for 1897-8, and of the proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor General thereon."

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPER-ANNUATION BILL.

The East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill was read a third time, and passed.

April 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE PLAGUE.

SIR WALTER FOSTER asked the President of the Local Government Board whether the Indian transport "Dilwara," which arrived at Southampton on 6th April, had had a fatal case of plague on board during her voyage:

Whether the local authorities found their sanitary powers sufficient to protect the local health interests:

And, whether that was the second occasion within the last few months on which the infection of plague on board ship had been successfully dealt with in this country without any resort to quarantine detention of vessels and persons.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: A fatal case of plague occurred on board the Indian transport "Dilwara" after the vessel had left Bombay. The body was buried at sea; and under the recent Venice Convention, only the two actual attendants on the sick person were detained at Suez (Moses' wells), the vessel at once passing through the canal in quarantine. On reaching Southampton on April 6 the "Dilwara" was met by a medical inspector of the Board, who acted in concert with the military and local port authorities. No further case had occurred, and under the excellent arrangements organised by the port medical officer all the 1,235 persons on board were allowed to land, and the existing powers were found to be fully sufficient to protect all health interests concerned. The hon. member is quite correct in his assumption. This is the second occasion within the last few months on which the infection of plague on board ship has been successfully dealt with without resort to any quarantine detention of either vessels or persons. (Hear, hear.)

May 3rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

East India. (Bubonic Plague).—Petition of Nandram Onkardar Mavadi, for alteration of Plague Laws; to lie upon the Table.

INDIA AND THE "DIAMOND JUBILEE."

MR. PARKER SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India whether he proposed to make provision for any representation of the more distinguished regiments of the Native Infantry being present in London on the occasion of Her Majesty's Jubilee.

Captain BAGOT asked the Secretary of State for India whether any and, if so, what regiments of Indian Native Infantry were going to be represented on the occasion of the celebration of the 60th year of Her Majesty's reign.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: On the occasion of the Jubilee in 1887, it was decided that the Indian Army as a whole should be represented by 13 officers of native Cavalry; and it is proposed on the present occasion to follow that precedent, but to increase the number from 13 to 22. To these will be added 12 native officers representing the Imperial Service troops, which are maintained by the Native States for service with the regular army in time of war. Any proposal to bring home a selection of Native Infantry soldiers and at the same time to keep the numbers of the representative detachment within reasonable bounds, was held in 1887, and is held now, to be attended by almost insuperable difficulties.

These difficulties I much regret, for I should have been glad to have been able to give prominence at Her Majesty's Jubilee to the Native Infantry who have on so many occasions done such splendid service for the Empire.

May 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE ACCOUNTS OFFICE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the circular, dated 11th January, 1897, and issued at the instance of Sir James Westland, by the Comptroller-General of India to his nine subordinates, with reference to the appointment of a number of higher classed clerks, at salaries of 60 rupees and upwards per month to the Accounts Office:

And, whether these selections were to be made without the test of examination, and from among Europeans and Eurasians; and whether the reason assigned by the Finance Minister for such a step was to prevent the offices being filled with Bengalees exclusively.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I have not seen the circular itself, but I have read the reference to it in the proceedings of the Legislative Council on the 13th and 27th of March, and the orders of Government therein mentioned.

These orders state that, the appointments being probationary, there is an opportunity to select for the higher posts either graduates or others qualified by their education, or candidates from other branches of the service. It is pointed out that promotion from the lower grades is in no way forbidden, but that "by confining the higher appointments too narrowly to persons who have entered the service in the lower grades, the very classes of natives among whom the best and most competent officers are likely to be found are excluded."

May 10th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENT.

On the motion of Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS, a "Return was granted showing the Charges of the Ecclesiastical Establishment in India, for the year 1895-6 on account of the Church of England, Church of Scotland, Church of Rome, and other Churches; and showing as far as possible, in the several Provinces of British India, what payments are made at stations (a) where there are European troops, and (b) where there are no European troops."

THE VAGARIES OF "POLITICAL AGENTS."

MR. PICKERBAILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the indignities alleged to have been inflicted on the widow of the Nawab of Radhanpur through the political agent, Major Lyde, under

whose order the guards were removed from the zenana, the Begum's allowances stopped, her jewels and wardrobe seized, and property assigned to her by the will of the Nawab taken away:

Whether he was aware that, under the pretext of securing hidden treasures, the palace had been rudely rifled two or three times, the last occasion being so recently as the 15th April:

If treasure had been found at the palace, was he satisfied that it belonged to the State, and not to the estate of the late Nawab, to be applied for purposes designated in his will:

And, could copies of the reports of the political agent, and of the memorial presented by the Begum to the Bombay Government, be laid upon the Table, together with such replies as Lord Sandhurst's Government might have recorded in reference to these transactions.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I am aware of the circumstances to which the hon. member's question relates. The object of the measures which have been taken was to prevent the misappropriation of property which belongs to the State of Radhanpur, and I am advised that the Government of Bombay is satisfied that the property thus recovered is State property, with the exception of certain articles which, as soon as they were proved to belong to the Hindu widow of the late Nawab, were at once restored to her. I have no reason to believe that any harsh or offensive measures were employed. When the correspondence relating to this matter is complete, I will consider whether it can be laid on the Table of the House.

May 13th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPER-ANNUATION BILL.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW moved the Second Reading of the East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill, the object of which is to set at rest certain doubts which have arisen as to the powers of the Secretary of State with regard to officers who were originally upon the establishment of the East India Company, and have now, under the Act of Parliament, been transferred to the control of the Secretary of State for India in Council. There were, he said, only 12 of them still surviving.

The Bill was read a second time.

REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS' FUNDS BILL.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW, in moving the Second Reading of the Regular and Elders' Widows' Funds Bill, said this, again, was a Bill to set at rest certain legal doubts respecting the vesting in the Secretary of State the surplus funds belonging to this institution. By actuarial calculation it had been discovered that the assets were considerably in excess of the liabilities, and, as the object of the fund would in the course of a very short time come to an end, it was deemed advisable that whatever might be left over should be vested in the Secretary of State, instead of in the hands of trustees who were under legal disability from transferring them to any other person.

The Bill was read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Singh, Gopal.—Petition of Gopal Singh, for redress of grievances: to lie upon the Table.

THE INDIAN BUDGET—PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Finance and Revenue Accounts).—Copy presented,—of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1895-6 [by Act]: to lie upon the Table.

East India (Home Accounts).—Copy presented,—of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act] to lie upon the Table.

"EXCHANGE COMPENSATION" ALLOWANCE.

Sir SYMONS KING asked the Secretary of State for India,

whether he was yet in a position to announce the decision of the Government of India in regard to the various questions still pending in respect of exchange compensation.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Exchange compensation is authorised for Europeans appointed in England, and for officers appointed as Europeans in India to offices in which European qualifications are held to be indispensable, or to services and departments in which a proportion of Europeans is held by the Government of India to be indispensable. The Government of India are now considering the rules which must be issued in order to carry into effect this decision of the Secretary of State in Council.

PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT MONUMENTS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would state what had been done with reference to a memorial on the subject of the preservation of ancient monuments in India, which was presented to the Secretary of State for India on the 13th July, 1894, on behalf of the Royal Academy of Arts, the Society of Antiquaries of London, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, and the Royal Archaeological Institute:

And, whether he would lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence which had taken place regarding that memorial.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The memorial cited in the hon. baronet's question was forwarded in April, 1894, to the Government of India for their consideration. I am not aware what measures, if any, the Government of India have taken in consequence of the suggestions which it contains, but I will enquire, and will communicate the result to the hon. member. At present the correspondence cannot be regarded as complete, but, when it is so, I will consider whether papers can be laid on the Table.

SUGGESTED REDUCTION OF THE SALT-TAX.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that there was a very general feeling in India that the high duty on salt should be reduced for this year at least, in view of the sufferings of the poorer classes from famine, the loss of revenue caused thereby being included in the cost of famine relief:

Whether he was aware that such reduction could be effected by an executive order of the Government of India:

And, whether he would direct the Government of India to issue such an order.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I am not aware that there is any general feeling in India that the salt duty should be reduced for one year. I may, on the contrary, point out that any such limitation of the period of reduction would be practically impossible, because, if an abatement for one year only were announced enough salt for consumption during a very much longer period would undoubtedly be drawn out of bond or otherwise passed into stock within the year. The price of salt is now, for the majority of the people of India, lower than it was 20, 30 or 40 years ago, and the incidence of the duty is about 4½d. per head per annum. In these circumstances, although I feel most deeply for the sufferings which a large number of Her Majesty's Indian subjects have been and are undergoing, I do not propose to issue any orders with regard to the salt duty.

"EXCHANGE COMPENSATION" ALLOWANCE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Viceroy of India, the Governors and Lieutenant-Governors of Presidencies and Provinces, and members of the different councils drew Exchange compensation allowance in addition to their salaries; whether the salaries of some of them were not fixed in rupees by Statute; and whether the grant of the allowance taken without statutory amendment was legal:

And, whether it was a fact that the allowance was granted to such European officers as made no remittances to England; and, if so, on what grounds.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Exchange compensation has hitherto been drawn by all the European officers in India who are entitled to it under the regulations. Among these are about 40 officers whose salaries are fixed in rupees under

Statute; and doubts have been raised whether, in their case, the compensation, though obviously equitable, may not be technically illegal. Opinions on that point differ, and the matter is now under my consideration with a view of obtaining further advice.

The compensation allowance is intended to protect European officers in India against an excessive depreciation of their emoluments by the fall in exchange, and is confined by the regulations to those classes which as a rule are seriously affected by it: but it is not thought necessary or advisable to make any special enquiry into the private circumstances of individual officers.

May 14th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA.

THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN rose to call attention to the prevalence of contagious diseases in her Majesty's Army, especially in India, and to move, "That, in view of the Report of the Departmental Committee of the India Office of February 20, 1897, it is, in the opinion of this House, urgently necessary that an enquiry be made into the effect of such diseases upon the forces of the Crown, the civil population, and the native races within her Majesty's dominions, and into the nature and results of the measures which are or have been in force in this and other countries for the prevention of such diseases." He observed that the report which had been issued by the Departmental Committee made it unnecessary for him to go in great detail into ancient facts and statistics, but it opened up a very much larger aspect of the whole case, because it referred not only to the reaction of the disease upon her Majesty's troops in India, but also to the reaction and its effects upon the whole population at home. While he most heartily approved and applauded what the Government had done, he could not conscientiously say he believed that any measures which might be taken by the Indian Government subject to the limitations which were laid down in the despatch of the Secretary of State would prove efficacious in dealing with this evil, which was so detrimental to the strength of the army in India and so dangerous to the health of the whole community at home. In 1887 the admissions to hospital from venereal diseases were 362 per 1,000. In 1895 they had risen to 537 per 1,000. That was to say, that during those eight years the proportion of men on the sick list owing to those causes had increased at the rate of 48 per cent., and more than half the total number of the forces in India had been affected by the diseases. The report of the Committee stated that in 1895, 46 per 1,000, or, altogether, 3,200 men, out of a total force of 71,031, were constantly in hospital from this cause. These were terribly high figures: but, bad as they were, they did not, as the report showed, by any means represent the actual inefficiency, for there were cases which, being treated outside the hospital, did not come into the returns at all. There were men treated for diseases of another character which were either induced or greatly aggravated by venereal disease, and numbers of men were discharged from hospital as cured who were yet totally unfit for active service. Among 5,822 men detailed for field service with the Chifral relief force, 462, or nearly 8 per cent., had to be rejected for venereal disease, and 279 more, or an additional 4½ per cent., had to be transferred from field hospitals to the base from the same cause. Calculating on that basis, they were face to face with the appalling fact that out of a force of 70,000 men, no less than 9,000, or 13 per cent. of the whole, were unfit for active service owing to a cause which, to a great extent at any rate, was a preventable cause. (Hear, hear.) Putting aside altogether their duty as a civilised country, putting aside what he thought was their duty as a humane nation acting within the spirit of the religion they professed, putting aside also the protective duty that Parliament owed to the whole community, and looking at the matter purely from a commercial point of view as a mere question of pounds, shillings, and pence, it was perfectly plain that if efficacious steps could be taken to check the ravages of this disease there would be a greater gain to the efficiency of the army than there would be by the increase to the army that the Legislature had recently sanctioned. The knowledge of the prevalence of these diseases had a most detrimental effect on recruiting. Not only had the

diseases increased enormously in quantity, but they had also increased enormously in virulence. In 1887 there were 20 per 1,000 suffering from secondary syphilis. That number had been steadily rising until it now amounted to 85 per 1,000. The returns for 1894 showed that, out of a total of 70,000 men in India, 5,421 had been in hospital for secondary diseases during the term of their Indian service, and probably many more were suffering from the same disease who had not been treated in hospital for it. The officials at Netley declared that never had there been so many cases of secondary syphilis in the hospital, nor of so bad a type. Consider the effect that that must have upon the civil population at home. Out of 13,000 men who returned from India every year, 3,640 were impregnated with this terrible and fatal disease, and a very small proportion were married. They become absorbed in the population at home; they married, and in many cases they transmitted the disease to their innocent offspring. The present condition of the army in India was therefore a great and growing source of danger to the whole community, and the influence which it was liable to exercise on the whole population was one of the gravest aspects of the whole question, worthy of the attention not only of Parliament, but of the whole country. The gravity of the disease had always been known; the Royal College of Physicians, among other authorities, describing it as "one of the most serious, insidious, and lasting of all the contagious diseases that afflict humanity." A constant stream of men was being poured into the population and absorbed by it, conveying the most persistent and the most virulent poison known into the blood of the people. As to the army generally, he maintained that the figures were not creditable to us. In round numbers, the figures per 1,000 were—in Germany 27, France 44, Russia 43, Austria 65, Italy 71, and British troops in the United Kingdom 204. Various measures had been enforced both at home and in India to deal with the evil. He admitted that the preventive and sanitary measures adopted in India had been more or less a partial failure, because they had disappointed those who had expected better results. But the causes of the partial failure were the change to the short service system, which sent into India a very large number of very young and inexperienced men; the creation of camps of exercise, and the greater movement of troops throughout the country. When the men were in the cantonments they were influenced by the regulations in force; when they were absent from the cantonments they were not so influenced, and it would be found that disease increased whenever large numbers of men were absent from the cantonments and decreased when they were within the sphere of influence of protective and sanitary measures. Strong presumptive evidence on that point was made conclusive by the enormous increase in disease and the increase in its severity since the Indian Government were obliged, owing to a most lamentable resolution of the Legislature (cheers), to abolish the regulations. That view was borne out by all the authorities most competent to judge. An experiment was made by the Indian Government in 1884. They closed some hospitals to see what the result would be; and in 1885 it was reported that the experimental closure had resulted in "such an enormous and progressive increase in the prevalence of disease that the military authorities considered it absolutely essential to the efficiency of the troops stationed in the cantonments concerned that the Lock hospitals should be speedily re-opened and the preventive rules again enforced." The Army Sanitary Commission reported not many years ago rather adversely to the regulations, but now they said, "We have now proof that the measures heretofore adopted in India, imperfectly administered as they often were, nevertheless exercised a very sensible influence in checking increase in the number of British soldiers admitted into hospital for venereal disease and in mitigating the severity of the disease itself." After indicating that both in this country and in India regulations and sanitary measures had proved most beneficial, he stated that there was an Act in force in India dealing with other contagious diseases like typhoid, cholera, and small-pox; but, owing to the resolution of the House of Commons, this particular disease was not allowed to come under the operation of the sanitary rules. This disease was made a privileged disease (cheers), and allowed to contract itself out of the Act. He was glad to say that the Government had relieved the country of that gross slur on its common sense and humanity. (Hear, hear.) At any rate, this disease was placed in the same category as all other contagious diseases. But he did not see how it was

possible for a medical officer to obtain credible testimony of disease in this instance. He insisted on the necessity of medical examination if any effective action was to be taken, and said he should be perfectly content if the Indian Government had a free hand in the matter. The other day the committee of the Institute of Public Health, under the chairmanship of Lord Playfair, were preparing a congratulatory address to her Majesty on the great progress made in matters of public health during her reign. A great advance had indeed been made except in one particular, and was it not a scandalous thing, an iniquitous thing, that if they wished to congratulate the Sovereign they must either wilfully shut their eyes to the existence of a terrible evil or they must admit that never during her reign had her forces been so decimated by disease and never had the country been in such danger from the same cause? (Cheers.) That was due to the action of Parliament in deference to a genuine but a very mistaken opinion. (Cheers.) He could not understand why all people who recognised the danger of pouring a poison of this kind into the blood of the nation could not unite in their efforts to cleanse the blood of the Army and to purge the blood of the nation, and to remove so great a scandal from us as a civilised State. As practical men they had to deal with men as they were, and not as they ought to be. If the time came when moral force was sufficiently strong to enable men, at the age when the instincts were strongest and the will power weakest, successfully to resist one of the most dominating of human instincts, then there would be no need for sanitation. But, while we did everything possible to bring that time about, it surely behoved us meanwhile to do what could legitimately be done to save these men and the whole nation from the effects of acts which might be immoral and improper. (Hear, hear.) There were many matters in connexion with this subject on which information was needed. Whether the general sanitary law in India could be made more effective; the general and local amount and character of the disease in India; the regulations enforced in other countries and the colonies, especially where they had dealings with native races; all these were questions about which information was difficult to obtain. He did not know where he should go to learn what effect we had had upon the native races with which we had come into contact. That subject had never been much noticed, but it ought to be; because, though we might have a perfect right to colonise and extend our possessions, we could not have any moral right to plant alongside the flag the seeds of an insidious and terrible disease. (Hear, hear.) Public opinion needed instruction, though, thank God! it had greatly changed on this matter. The great mass of opinion in the country was beginning to realise the gravity of the evil, and the sinfulness of inaction. The Departmental Committee had performed a most admirable work in bringing together in an accessible form the immense amount of information which was before diffused and difficult to obtain; and he thought that an investigation and report of a similar character, but more extensive, would be the best form of enquiry to hold. Nearly all that was wanted could be obtained from the three Departments most concerned—the War Office, the Colonial Office, and the India Office; but the information must be collated, weeded, examined, and brought into accessible shape, so that those who wished to instruct themselves on this great national matter should have facilities for doing so. (Hear, hear.) He was rather puzzled to know what to do in respect to the amendment which was to be moved. Theoretically, he entirely agreed with it; but he did not see how it was practicable. But perhaps if the House agreed to his motion and refused to accept the amendment, they might put themselves in a position which would be capable of misconstruction. In some quarters his motion had been misconstrued as a dilatory motion; but nothing was further from his intentions. He asked for an enquiry because he thought information was greatly needed to educate public opinion. He entirely applauded her Majesty's Government for the steps which they had taken; but he feared that they would not prove effectual, and that their comparative failure would be used as an argument against any regulations. He looked upon this as a matter of great national moment. (Cheers.) It was not a question of party. (Hear, hear.) He would support any Government which attempted to deal efficaciously with this great evil; and he was certain that the great bulk of common-sense opinion in the country would sustain this or any Government in a resolute attempt to check the ravages of an evil

which was so detrimental to her Majesty's forces and so dangerous to the whole population, and which was a scandal to this country as a great people and a civilised nation (Cheers.)

LORD ROBERTS OF KANDAHAR said: The subject brought forward by the noble lord is one which nobody would willingly discuss in public if he could conscientiously avoid doing so, and I have been most reluctant to take part in this debate. But, my lords, I recognise so strongly the necessity for measures being adopted to arrest the progress of a great and growing evil—an evil which is sapping the strength of our army and paralysing many of our best troops—that I feel I should be wanting in my duty to my country and the service to which I have the honour to belong, were I to shrink from speaking plainly or neglect to do whatever lies in my power to make my countrymen understand the culpability of permitting to continue unchecked a horrible disease, so far-reaching in its results that it threatens seriously to injure the health and physique of a large proportion of the population of the United Kingdom. (Hear, hear.) I do not propose to take up your lordships' time by giving detailed statistics of the disastrous effects of this disease upon the British troops in India; the proceedings of the committee presided over by the Under-Secretary of State for India show how appalling these effects are. I wish merely to draw your attention, my lords, to two facts which completely, I think, prove the fallacy of the assertion that contagious disease in India has not increased since the abolition of the Contagious Diseases Acts, and clearly demonstrate the necessity for action being taken without delay to preserve the health and efficiency of British soldiers serving in our Eastern Empire. One of the facts, my lords, which I would bring to your notice is the extraordinary number of men now being invalided from India, suffering from the effects of this loathsome disease, as compared with the numbers invalided from the same cause when the Contagious Diseases Act was in force. In the statement which I hold in my hand the comparison is made out for 1879 and 1880, the two years immediately preceding the relaxation of the regulations framed under the Contagious Diseases Act, and for 1894 and 1895, the two latest years for which returns are available. In 1879 and 1880 the number of British soldiers in India (exclusive of those on service in Afghanistan) were respectively 49,507 and 50,136. During these two years only 126, or less than 13 per cent., were invalided to England on account of this special disease. In 1894 and 1895 the number of British soldiers in India were respectively 70,983 and 68,331, of whom a total of no less than 648, or nearly 5 per cent., were sent home from this same cause. In other words, the proportion of men invalided during the latter period on account of this disease was more than four times as great as it was when the Contagious Diseases Act was in force. (Hear, hear.) The other fact, my lords, to which I would draw your attention is the number of British soldiers who were found unfit to do their duty during the short time the Chitral expeditionary force was employed in 1895. That force consisted, in round numbers, of 6,000 British and 11,000 native soldiers. The troops selected were all medically examined before the expedition started, and about 8 per cent. of the British soldiers were weeded out as unfit for service on account of this most horrible form of contagious disease. The force crossed the frontier on April 3, and by July 31, less than four months, 957 British and only 294 native soldiers had been sent back sick to India. And Lieut.-General Sir Robert Low, commanding the force, reported that this enormous excess of British soldiers was entirely due to contagious disease, not disease contracted locally, for the condition of affairs rendered that an impossibility, but the old disease breaking out afresh in consequence of the hardships and privations of a four months' campaign. In all other respects the British were as healthy as the native soldiers; so, taking the number of natives sent back as normal, the proportion of British should have been 160, instead of 957. Or, to put it in plainer language, 797 men, more than 13 per cent. of the British troops engaged, were rendered unfit for their duty as soldiers, and therefore a useless expense to the State, from what the majority of our medical officers call preventable disease. These figures, and those given in Lord Onslow's report, alarming as, I think, my lords, you must consider them, for they show that one-fourth of the 70,000 soldiers serving in India are unable to take the field from contagious disease and its consequent disabilities, cannot be gainsaid. And they further prove how fallacious is the argument urged by the

opponents of the Contagious Diseases Act, that the protective regulations enforced under that Act failed to mitigate the evil which caused them to be introduced. I know, my lords, that those regulations did not work all the good that was hoped for, but this was not the fault of the regulations, but of the half-hearted manner in which they were applied. So apathetically were they brought into force that, although the Cantonment Act which legalised the regulations was passed in 1864, it was not until 1869, five years later, that Fort William and its environs were protected, although this is certainly the station most in need of precautionary measures on account of its immediate proximity to the city of Calcutta. Up to the last, 12 military stations in Bengal were left unprotected, and at three of those stations in 1879 the number of admissions to hospital from contagious disease actually rose to upwards of 700 per 1,000 men. I think, my lords, you must agree with me that it speaks well for the beneficial results of the Act that, notwithstanding these astounding figures were included in the total number of registered cases during the year, the proportion of men invalided was, as I have already shown, nearly four times greater in 1894 and 1895 than it was in 1879 and 1880. The truth is, my lords, the Contagious Diseases Act was never given a fair trial in India. It was not believed in by the authority responsible to the Government of India for its being properly carried out, and, in consequence, no attempt was ever made to investigate the working of the Act or to ascertain what cases of disease were contracted within the area to which the Act applied, and what cases were contracted outside that area; so that, even if every station in India had been brought within the scope of the Act, the good really done by the Act could not have been correctly appreciated from the figures furnished by the sanitary commissioner. Tables prepared from such unreliable data were bound to bring the Act into disrepute, and to strengthen the arguments of those who were, and are still, opposed to its introduction. Then, again, my lords, the Act was administered in some places with zeal and intelligence by medical officers, in others it was carried on in a very perfunctory manner. When visiting Lock hospitals I invariably found that success was complete when the medical officer in charge took an interest in his work and satisfied himself that those who came for treatment were properly looked after. The disease under such auspices diminished rapidly, and at one station, where it had been extremely prevalent, it was almost entirely stamped out owing to the exertions of the medical officer. I am well aware, my lords, that those who are opposed to the enforcement of the Contagious Diseases Act contend that direct interference is adverse to morality, and that, in all justice, the sinner should be allowed to reap the punishment of his sin. Although to my mind this is not a very Christian doctrine, I can understand and respect the horror of wrong-doing of which it is the outcome, provided the punishment could be confined to the sinner himself; but what I cannot understand is how any one can think it right to take no measures to prevent the spread of an evil which involves disease and misery on innocent women and children, and which must seriously injure equally innocent generations in the future. In my opinion it is as bad or worse than it would be to allow a mad dog to bite as many people as he felt inclined, or to permit a person known to have smallpox or diphtheria to mix freely with people in health. I say worse, because the evil in such cases might, at all events, be limited to those bitten or infected; while, in the other, it is impossible to calculate how far-reaching will be the deadly results of neglecting to take precautions. My lords, we have to deal with human nature, and, in considering the question at issue, we must not lose sight of the fact that, year by year, several thousand young men—mere boys, indeed—freed from all moral restraint, arrive in India and are at once subject to great and peculiar temptations. For many months of the year they are necessarily kept within barracks from sunrise to sunset, only to emerge when darkness, which comes on so rapidly in the East, prohibits anything in the shape of such healthy recreation as out-door games. A great deal has been done of late years by the Government of India to enable the men to amuse themselves in a rational manner, by providing comfortable and attractive reading-rooms, coffee shops, etc. These regimental institutes, as they are called, have helped to raise the tone of our soldiers and to reduce crime, especially drunkenness, but they seem to have had, I regret to say, but little effect in preventing contagious disease, which, though it might have assumed still

more gigantic proportions had these counter-attractions been provided, has, notwithstanding all that has been done in this direction, gone on steadily increasing, as your lordships will perceive from Lord Onslow's committee's report. Other and more direct measures should now be resorted to. The disease under consideration ought to be treated as all other contagious diseases are treated. It is even more essential that precautionary measures should be adopted in regard to it than to any other disease, for, as stated in the report of the Royal College of Physicians, dated March 23 last, "the constitutional form of the disease is one of the most serious, insidious and lasting of all the contagious diseases that afflict humanity." When it is prevalent there should be periodical examinations of all unmarried soldiers during their first period of service, and of older soldiers, if thought necessary, and any infringement of the order requiring men to report themselves on the first sign of becoming affected should be severely punished. There ought to be no doubt as to the intention of these orders in the Army Regulations, but I am afraid that they are now frequently lost sight of and the importance of strictly enforcing them not thoroughly appreciated. With regard to women, I would leave the matter in the hands of the Government of India, on the distinct understanding, as stated in the Secretary of State's despatch, that "there must be nothing which can be represented as an encouragement to vice." In the interests of morality, and to protect, as far as possible, young soldiers from temptation, women professionally belonging to a certain class should be forbidden to reside in regimental bazaars or follow regiments on the line of march. And in every military station all women, professional or otherwise, known to have communicated disease to a soldier, should be obliged to submit to medical treatment and subsequent periodical examinations, or to quit the station and its immediate neighbourhood. Each case of expulsion should be carried out in communication with the local civil authorities, who will, I trust, be empowered to take such further action as may be considered necessary for the protection of the community at large. To limit the Contagious Diseases Act (or whatever regulations the Government of India may think proper to introduce) to cantonments and to exclude the neighbouring cities and towns would, in my opinion, be altogether insufficient, and would certainly not get at the root of the evil. There must, of course, be some punishment, such as fine or imprisonment, for disobedience of orders, but my belief is that it would seldom have to be enforced if the women are kindly treated in the Government hospitals. The employment of women as coolies in the construction and repairs of barracks should be discouraged, but where this kind of labour is unavoidable special precautions should be taken by means of civil and regimental police. These are surely only reasonable preventive measures, in the enforcement of which there should be little difficulty, for the calling of every person in a cantonment in India is well known. Boundary pillars mark off the space set apart for the soldiers' barracks, parade ground, and officers' quarters, and within these limits, at any rate, it is our bounden duty to protect the health of our soldiers, who, we must remember, are cut off from the pleasures and enjoyments of home life, and are compelled to live as single men for a certain number of years. If there is reason to suspect that the disease is contracted outside the cantonment limits, the country round should be put out of bounds and the number of men on duty as regimental police should be increased until matters improve. I have myself found this an effective way of checking the spread of this terrible scourge. I believe that much valuable assistance might be afforded by military chaplains if they would interest themselves in the matter. An excellent example has been set by the Rev. John Crauford, a Presbyterian clergyman at Meerut, who, a few years ago, established a "Purity Society" at that station for the benefit of soldiers, many of whom joined it, with the happiest results both as regards health and conduct. Something also might be gained by warning young and inexperienced soldiers, on first arrival in India, of the aggravated effects of immorality in such a climate, and its appalling results, as can be seen at Netley Hospital. I am certain, too, that medical officers would be able to do a great deal towards the desired end if they were brought into closer communication with troops than they are at present. (Hear, hear.) They never now see or know the men as they did formerly, except those who come to them for treatment in hospital; and the cordial intercourse which used to exist between the combatant and medical officers, and

which was so conducive to good fellowship and to the general health of the army (cheers), is, unfortunately, a thing of the past. I trust, my lords, I have not wearied you. (Cries of "No.") My excuse for taking up so much of your time is that the efficiency of the army and the moral and material well-being of the soldiers I love so well are at stake. I beg you, my lords, to give this painful subject your most careful consideration, and I earnestly hope that the British public may be induced to look upon it from a wise and prudent, as well as from a merciful and Christian, point of view. (Cheers.)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I am grateful to the noble earl and the gallant general for the way in which they have handled what is unquestionably a very difficult subject. I do not think it can be denied that the disease and its effects have come to such a point that it is impossible to refuse a thorough enquiry into the whole matter. I do not think it is possible to read the papers which have been distributed to members of this House without feeling that it is the imperative duty of the Legislature to look into the matter and see what ought to be done. (Hear, hear.) I think there is one class of consideration which has not received full attention in either of the speeches we have listened to; it is quite certain that you cannot get to the root of such an evil as this without giving a very large part of your attention to the moral side of the whole question. The old regulations were objected to, and not a moment too soon, because they unquestionably had the effect of giving the impression to the soldiers that the sin in which they were indulging was not anything very wrong in itself, and that it was the business and purpose of the Government not to stamp the sin as an evil, but only to stop the effects of it. I do not think there can be any doubt that that was the only impression which could be made upon the soldiers at the time when it was the custom to provide for the indulgence of this sin by special establishments. It was a long time ago, but there still remains the same kind of impression. The authorities should make it very clear that they look upon this kind of indulgence as a very evil thing which is to be condemned by every good man and by every good soldier. If you can change the tone of the army in that respect, you will have done something towards getting rid of the evil. It can never be done by mere regulations, and if your regulations are of such a character as to maintain the belief that you do not really care about the wrong of the self-indulgence, and that you only want to have soldiers who can fight, depend upon it all your regulations will fall short of really extirpating the mischief. It is the habitual and continued indulgence that keeps up this mischief, and the temptation is increased by barrack-room conversation and the way in which the soldiers regard the sin itself. As long as that is the case you cannot have the co-operation of the men themselves in getting rid of the evil, and without their own co-operation it is hopeless to endeavour to raise any class of men to a higher position. If you leave out all this moral consideration, and think only of sanitary regulations as if they were really the complete remedy, every now and then you will find that your sanitary regulations will altogether fail. If there is to be an enquiry, it ought to go beyond the mere examination of the sanitary regulations that may be made, and should consider how you can get at the soldier's conscience and his habits of life. How very much more might be done, for instance, if a larger number of men were allowed to marry. It would, no doubt, cost you money, but it will not cost you as much as the present evil costs you. Something has been done, no doubt, to employ the soldiers and to keep their minds away from that sensuality which, when once men have allowed their imaginations to be affected by it, is sure to constantly recur to their minds. More may be done by occupying them in employment agreeable and interesting to them in their idle moments, and a great deal more than has yet been tried should be tried in this regard. I am only using this as an illustration of what I mean. I do not mean there are not many other things I could mention myself that could be done with this view. But what I want to emphasise is that in all that is done the moral impress made on the troops is to be one of the first considerations, and that, whatever regulations you make, you are doing, perhaps, benefit for the moment, but certain mischief for the future, if you let soldiers think you do not care whether they are moral or not. (Hear, hear.) I think, my lords, an enquiry which looked into this side of the matter with as much care as a medical man would naturally bestow upon the material side, an enquiry of that kind would

really be of great benefit. I do not propose to move any amendment to the resolution, or to vote against it. I believe that such an enquiry as the noble lord proposes, if only it be conducted by men who will look at both sides of the matter and will be thoroughgoing in looking at the moral side, may be of the greatest benefit. Lord Kinnaird proposes to add something to the resolution. The noble lord seemed to deprecate the addition. I confess I do not see why it should be said such an addition will in any way interfere with the enquiry proposed. It seems to me that if your enquiry is to be of permanent value, you must extend it to the whole subject. My lords, I cannot sit down without expressing my strong sense of deep gratitude to those who have brought this matter forward. I believe they have done no more than their duty. I believe that we may safely follow their lead, if only we are careful to see that the enquiry proposed shall not be confined entirely to physical considerations, which will be dealing, not with the root of the evil, but only with the symptoms of it, and which will leave untouched that out of which the whole thing comes. If we can have an enquiry which will avoid that, I believe it will be of the greatest use. My lords, these young men who are so readily tempted to fall come often from country villages, from the artisan class in the towns. They often have not lived very excellent lives before they enlist. Nevertheless, you do not find among them anything like the mischief you are now finding in your army. And why? Because they have so much else to occupy their minds, because the moral influences around them are so much higher than the moral influences they find among their comrades when they join their regiments. They are protected by their surroundings, and soldiers are not. Look to it and see whether something may not be done, something very real, to raise the whole tone of the service in this matter. Lord Roberts pointed out to us various particulars in which he plainly aimed at that purpose. I thank him. I only wish to emphasize what he has said, and to press upon you that it is in that direction you must look if you desire to obtain permanent benefit. (Cheers.)

THE EARL OF ONSLOW said he welcomed the contribution to the debate that had just fallen from the most reverend prelate, because he gathered from his remarks that he entirely agreed in the opinion already expressed that the magnitude of the evil was such that some steps must be speedily taken to put an end if possible to so terrible an evil. But when he joined with Lord Dunraven in desiring an enquiry he himself would suggest that the time for enquiry was past and the time for action had arrived. (Hear, hear.) He hoped Lord Dunraven would not persist in his motion for two reasons—first, because he thought any exhaustive enquiry by a committee or commission might have the effect of leading some of those who were not prepared to take immediate action to point to the proceedings of the enquiry as a reason for not taking immediate action. Secondly, he hoped the motion would not be pressed, because he hardly knew in what direction it would be possible to produce more facts or figures than those already available. The amount of literature on the subject was something overwhelming. Lord Dunraven asked that an enquiry should be held into the effect of contagious disease on the forces of the Crown. Every year the Army Medical Department issued a report which dealt with the affliction of the troops from these diseases in all parts of her Majesty's dominions, whether they were Europeans, Asiatics, or Africans. Lord Dunraven desired that an enquiry should be held into the effect of the disease upon the civil population. In the course of the enquiry to which allusion had already been made he endeavoured to obtain from the principal hospitals in London and the large towns of England some information as to the proportion of these diseases to others, their influence upon others, and the increase of hereditary disease. But he found that statistics were not kept on these heads, and in many cases venereal disease was not admitted. But if the noble earl desired to find out what was the effect of the disease on the civil population he had only to ask the superintendents of workhouses or the matrons of the women's hospitals or of the sick children's hospitals, or visit, he was sorry to say, the graves in our country churchyards to be at once informed that the evil was rapidly increasing throughout the country. As to its effect on native races throughout her Majesty's dominions no fewer than five large volumes had been presented to Parliament, the result of inquiries made by governors and medical officers in all parts of the Queen's

dominions. Lord Dunraven asked for the regulations here and in other countries. The regulations in Great Britain were set forth in the report of the committee of the House of Commons in 1888, and in the enquiry he himself recently held he obtained from our Ambassadors abroad a statement of the regulations in existence in each of the European countries and also the regulations affecting the troops of those countries. If Lord Dunraven would be content with a return to that effect he would have pleasure in laying it on the Table, and he trusted that with all this information he would see that no further enquiry was necessary. He would inform the House what had been the state of affairs during the last few years in India. In 1869 a new Cantonment Act was passed in consequence of a resolution of the House of Commons in 1868. In 1892 instructions were issued by the Government of India for the strict observance of the rules under that Act. It was claimed that those rules were not strictly observed, and Lord Lansdowne, then Viceroy of India, declared that the Government of India at least had loyally carried out the resolution of the House of Commons, though local authorities might in some instances have evaded orders. In 1894 the Secretary for India ordered the introduction into the Viceroy's Council of a new Act to amend the Cantonments Act of 1869, and further rules eliminating this particular class of diseases from the infectious and contagious disorders, sufferers from which might be expelled from the cantonments, and imposing a fine or imprisonment on any public servant subjecting women to compulsory examination. The Government of India strongly protested against that course, and said it was necessary to have power to exclude women from the cantonments, or at any rate they must have power to exclude persons without giving a reason. But the Secretary of State was unable to agree in this view, and his sanction was refused to any rules which would have that effect. So matters remained until recently, when public attention was forcibly drawn to the alarming increase of the disease in India and its appalling consequences. Upon that the Secretary of State had written a despatch with which most members of the House would be prepared to agree, and he should like to dwell on one or two of the conditions laid down, because he believed they would go a long way to meet not only the views of Lord Roberts, but also of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Government said they could not acquiesce in the continuance of the present state of things, and that common humanity, no less than their duty to the large body of British troops in India, demanded that some measures should be taken to restrain the prevalence of venereal disease. The despatch went on to say that there were certain things which must not be done—that was to say, there should be no approach to what had been called official purveying for immorality, and it gave power to the Government of India to expel from cantonments persons suffering from these diseases. It was quite true the result might be that there might be examination of women in some cases, but it would not be, as it was in the former case, compulsory, except in the same degree as it was now compulsory when a person suffered from smallpox, scarlet fever, or any of those diseases which the community had long since recognised to be a danger to public health. There were certain other measures which the Secretary of State had not yet prescribed, but which he had in his despatch invited advice from the Government of India upon. The first of these related to the taking of precautions to see that women were not employed about the barracks in the manner which Lord Roberts had shown had proved such a danger to the health of the soldiers. In the second place, the Secretary of State expressed to the Viceroy his desire to co-operate with him in every way in improving the moral and physical condition of the soldier. That was no new departure. For many years the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief had been doing their best to improve the moral condition of the soldier, and no one had done more than the noble and gallant lord who had addressed their lordships, and who had not only shown himself to be an incomparable captain in leading her Majesty's forces against an Asiatic enemy, but had endeared himself to the common soldiers in India by the efforts which he had successfully made to improve their condition in all the commands he had held in that dependency. (Hear, hear.) He agreed with the most reverend prelate that there was an opening not only for chaplains, but also for the commanding officers, to take this opportunity of inculcating upon the men under their command not only—as the Secretary of State had requested—the measures for the preservation of their health, but also impressing upon them

the sin and wickedness of indulging in these vices. The Secretary of State desired that the practice which was already in existence of warning young soldiers by regimental and medical officers of the risks they ran should in future be made universal. He had every reason to believe that the measures which the Secretary of State proposed to take would be efficacious, and the Viceroy had telegraphed on behalf of the Indian Government that the proposals of the Government “are in accord with our views, and, if sanctioned, will, we hope, enable us to combat successfully the spread of the disease.” One other important point the despatch dealt with was the remarkable fact that in some cantonments the disease had decreased, while in others it had increased to a great extent. It was not quite clear what was the reason for that variation between different stations, but he was inclined to agree with the explanation which had been suggested by Lord Roberts. The Government of India had been asked for further information upon this point. There was no reason to believe that women in India, any more than any one else, did not desire to be treated in hospital and regain their health, and he could not see upon what ground of Christian charity they could in any way say that the prevention of disease was not one of the first duties of a Government. (Hear, hear.) But how could they cure and how could they prevent disease if that disease was concealed? (Hear, hear.) It seemed to him the only course was to treat it like all other diseases and compel the immediate notification of it. Some of those who, not long ago, were most bitterly ranged against any preventive regulations now admitted that the time had arrived when something must be done. Their lordships might have observed the letter in the *Times* from Lady Henry Somerset, in which she recognised that this horrible scourge had brought upon thousands of innocent women in England a load of suffering, and said that she gladly welcomed the despatch of the Secretary of State as a statement of inspiring and controlling principles never yet professed by any previous Government. That was not an isolated instance. A memorial had been presented to the Secretary of State, and would shortly be made public, signed by a very large number of ladies of the highest position, philanthropists, nurses, superintendents and matrons of hospitals, wives of doctors and clergymen, all praying that immediate action might be taken to check the spread of this terrible disease and the ravages it was inflicting among the population at home. They stated that preventive measures, if exercised with scrupulous care, did not cause any real danger to women, but constituted a valuable safeguard to women's virtue and afforded a great opportunity of escape from a life of vice. He earnestly hoped the noble earl would not press his motion; but, whatever the result of that debate might be, her Majesty's Government felt that the time for action had arrived, and that it was necessary at once to take such steps as might seem to the Government of India and the Government in this country most likely to make a real and efficacious diminution in the disease. (Hear, hear.)

Lord REAY would like to move the adjournment of the debate if there was no objection on the part of the Government, as several noble lords were anxious to speak on the subject.

The MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE replied that the Government had no objection to the adjournment of the debate, which would be resumed as the first order on Monday.

The debate was accordingly adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LEAVE AND PENSION RULES.

MR. BARNES asked the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the despatch of the Government of India dated 20th September, 1893, on the leave and pension rules of the Civil (Uncovenanted) Service, published in the *Return* to an Address of this House dated 11th August, 1896, full consideration would be given to the dissenting minute of Sir Alexander Miller, legal member of the Viceroy's Council:

And whether a copy of the dissenting minute, which was referred to at page 32 of the said return, could be laid upon the Table of the House.

Lord G. HAMILTON: No separate dissent was recorded by Sir Alexander Miller. His views were expressed in the third

paragraph of the letter from the Government of India referred to, and were fully considered at the time by the Secretary of State in Council.

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had received any representative memorials or petitions from the general public on the subject of the proposals contained in his despatch of 26th March, 1897 for improving the health of the British troops in India; and, if so, whether he had any objection to make them public.

Lord G. HAMMOND: I have received only two memorials which can be held to be representative of general public opinion on the subject of my despatch of 26th March, 1897, regarding the health of British troops in India, and I have no objection to make them public.

A few memorials have also been received from local meetings and societies, embodying protests against the action taken by her Majesty's Government.

May 17th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPER-ANNUATION BILL.

The East India Company's Office Superannuation Bill was read a third time, and passed.

REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS' FUND BILL.

The Regular and Elders' Widows' Fund Bill was read a third time, and passed.

THE HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA.

The adjourned debate on the Earl of Dunraven's resolution urging that an enquiry ought to be made into the effect of contagious diseases upon the forces of the Crown, the civil population, and the native races within her Majesty's dominions, and into the nature and results of the preventive measures which are or have been in force in this and other countries, was resumed by

Lord REAY, who said that no one who had been responsible for any part of the administration of India could fail to recognise the extreme gravity of this question. The whole tendency of modern legislation was in favour of making the public acquainted with the laws of hygiene and of enforcing hygienic conditions. They segregated lunatics, lepers, habitual drunkards; and there seemed to be no reason why the same principle should not prevail in this case. This protection of the public health was due to the fact that society acted in self-defence. The progress of medicine had placed at their disposal effectual means of dealing with this disease, and the object of the legislation contemplated in the Secretary of State's despatch seemed to him to be to diffuse these means and place them at the disposal of those who required them, and to leave no excuse to anyone not to neglect the remedies which were available. He hoped that among the first measures which would be taken would be the reopening of the hospitals, and that every inducement would be held out to make the access to those hospitals as easy as possible. Apart from the general considerations which governed this matter, there were special considerations which applied to India. In India the causes which operated in favour of restraint were not as strong as they were in this country. The factor of racial difference was a very important one to take into account, and their obligations as the ruling race could not be overlooked. From the very nature of the circumstances they were exposed in India to constant criticism of very subtle minds for everything which was left undone. In India, besides, private initiative was much weaker than it was in this country; and what was left to charitable and benevolent agencies in this country must in India be undertaken by the State; hence the Government of India undertook a great many duties and functions which in this country were left to private initiative. Another and most important aspect of this question was the moral aspect. They removed their young soldiers from those influences which surrounded their homes; they were removed to other parts of the world, to other climatic conditions, to surroundings which in many respects were not conducive to a high moral standard. He

fully recognised what had been done for their benefit, but in this direction certainly more could and should be done. It was by individual effort and example that they would be able to strike at the root of this evil; and, if it was important to mitigate its results, it was certainly more important to remove the causes, to create a healthy environment, to improve the moral tone. The whole tone of society had been altered with regard to intemperance: that precedent was encouraging for those who believed that other evils might be grappled with in the same way—evils which struck at the vigour of our race. He heartily endorsed, therefore the instructions which had been given to the Government of India in the 14th paragraph of the Secretary of State's despatch. There was no antagonism between the scientific means and the moral means which could be used to cure disease. There was a double duty to be discharged by the combined forces of State agency and of moral and religious agency; and the Government of India had a perfect right to expect that in their renewed endeavours to deal with this evil they should have all the support which could be given them both here and in India to remove this frightful blot from our civilisation. He agreed with the noble earl opposite that there was no further need for enquiry. The evidence contained in the papers which had been laid on the Table seemed to him to be overwhelming; and, if anything further were necessary, he thought it was found in the advice received from the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons that immediate action was necessary. One of the conditions, if not one of the foundations, of our rule in India was moral prestige; and it was because he saw in the instructions which had been given to the Government of India by her Majesty's Government an endeavour to strengthen our moral prestige that he concurred in the steps which were proposed. (Hear, hear.)

Lord LISTER, on rising to address the House for the first time, was received with cheers. He said,—It is not necessary for me to add to the evidence already brought before your lordships as to the appalling gravity of the subject referred to in the resolution of the noble earl or to the tremendous importance of syphilitic disease and its far-reaching effects, not only to the person who contracts it, but to innocent women and to children in future generations. On this point I make one remark, that there is perhaps no more difficult thing for a surgeon to do than to give advice to a man when it is safe for him to enter into matrimony when he has once contracted syphilitic disease. I cordially welcome the action that has been taken by the Secretary for India in his recent despatch enacting that venereal disease, shall no longer be allowed to run riot in the army in India, as it has of late years, but that it shall be dealt with on the same principle as smallpox and other contagious or infectious diseases. I confess for my part that I should have been well pleased to have waited for the regulations which I believe the authorities in India are endeavouring to make, in accordance with the despatch of the Secretary of State, to see how far those regulations might be really efficient for the great object in view; but, as the matter has been brought forward, I feel bound to say that the despatch of the Secretary of State has been hampered with the restrictions which I cannot help fearing will seriously interfere with its utility. I will only refer to two of those restrictions. It is stated that there must be no compulsory and periodical examination of women, and the despatch proceeds to say that the cantonment rules which are in operation for other contagious or infectious diseases shall come into operation as regards venereal disease. Rule 5 says that "if the medical officer for the time being in charge of a hospital is informed, on testimony which he believes to be credible, that any person living in the cantonment is suffering from cholera, typhoid, smallpox, etc., he may by notice require such person to attend at the hospital at a time to be mentioned in such notice." Then Rule 6 says: "If any person on whom any such notice as mentioned in the last preceding rule shall have been served shall refuse or neglect to attend the hospital in pursuance of such notice, he shall be deemed to be suffering from such disease as aforesaid." And then Rule 7 sets forth that on the representation of the medical officer to the cantonment magistrate that such refusal has occurred, the person concerned who has refused may be expelled from the cantonment. Now, with regard to such diseases as smallpox this regulation, of course, is perfectly satisfactory. Such a disease, and others enumerated, carry upon their face the evidence of their existence by symptoms that any medical man can at once discern. But with venereal disease the case is totally different. In the

early stages of the complaint, in which it is of the most essential consequence that it should be recognised—for efficient treatment depends upon early recognition—there is no general effect produced upon the system whatsoever. The person appears to all ordinary examination perfectly healthy, and it is only by special examination, which if it is enacted shall not be compulsory, that evidence of the disease can be obtained. How can any notice be given to the medical man that a person has such a disease? Who is to give the notice? I do not understand it. In truth, it is the fact of prostitution, not evidence of the presence of venereal disease, on which the authorities must proceed. It may possibly be said that the despatch of the Secretary of State may be so construed that the mere fact of prostitution may be regarded as reasonable probability that the disease exists. If that be the construction put upon the despatch, my objection on that point would, of course, fall to the ground; but this is just one of the points on which I should like to have waited to see how the regulations could be framed. If they can be framed in the sense I have referred to, they may be so far efficacious. Then as to periodical examination. Suppose that any woman affected with venereal disease has been examined, treated and cured, after a certain time there would be just the same reason for re-examination to ascertain whether she may not be again diseased as there was in the first instance, and therefore, in order that the regulations may be effectual, there must be periodical examination. If it be said that this would be very like the introduction of the Contagious Diseases Acts, I must frankly confess that I have no objection in principle to these Acts. (Hear, hear.) It is admitted on all hands that prostitution cannot be dealt with criminally as an offence; but, on the other hand, if any woman chooses to place herself in such a position as to become a notorious source of serious danger to the community, it seems to me only reasonable that public steps should be taken to minimise such danger to the utmost. The Contagious Diseases Acts require that, in order that any woman might be subjected compulsorily to examination, a magistrate must be satisfied by sufficient evidence that she was a notorious prostitute. Of course, if there was any deficiency in the Act, not giving the woman charged the most ample chance of refuting the charge, that, of course, should be amended, but on principle there seems to me nothing to be objected to. In the Act of 1866 there was one matter which I did not like, and that was when the woman had been treated and was pronounced to be clear of the disease she received a certificate of such healthiness, which she was to carry about with her. Now that, I confess, savours pretty strongly of public licensing of immoral conduct, but in the Act of 1869 that was done away with. The certificate was no longer given to the woman, but to the police authorities, and this, surely, was perfectly right. As regards moral influences, I know as a hospital surgeon how very wholesome a moral influence residence in hospital does exert upon people of the humble and lower classes. I have often thought a severe accident might often have been a blessing in disguise to these poor people who first learnt what respect and gratitude are. For I am proud to say in the medical profession the same humane and kindly care is given to the most degraded as to the most exalted. (Cheers.) I have a very old friend whom I highly respect, a clergyman, who, at the time the Contagious Diseases Acts were in operation, knew many clergymen connected with the towns where the Acts were in force, and he tells me that without one solitary exception all those persons expressed approval of the effects of those Acts. (Cheers.) If we turn to the effects upon the disease as such, I have been told by an elderly practitioner who visited the Lock Hospital in London at a time when it was used not only for ordinary cases but also for cases under the Contagious Diseases Acts that there was the most extraordinary contrast between the two classes, as, indeed, must necessarily have been the case. The Government cases were, as a rule, very mild cases, because they had been taken in the early stages. I regret I have left behind me a letter I have received from a gentleman who has been for 14 years in practice in Brisbane in Australia, and who has now returned to England. But I may mention what its effect was. In the first place, he himself had a great objection to the Acts on the moral ground, and when he first went there he took the chair at a public meeting in opposition to the Act. The Act, however, was not abolished, and he confesses that women speak in unqualified approval of the effect of the Act in the town of Brisbane, venereal diseases in the whole community becoming

immensely reduced not only in number but in virulence, so that when any virulent case occurred they were able to treat it to outside places, where the Act did not operate. His only objection to the Act is that, as he says, the women are humiliated, and nothing is done to deal with the men who may infect them. I confess that objection seems a somewhat sentimental one as regards the civil population, because, in the first place, as regards the poor women, I do not think they need complain very much of the way in which they are treated; and, in the second place, to deal with the men in the civil population on the same lines is an absolute impossibility. But, on the other hand, it is by no means impossible in the Army (hear, hear); and I was exceedingly glad to hear that Lord Roberts approved of periodical inspection of the soldiers. I can conceive no objection whatsoever to such a course; only, let it be done, not, as I am told it is sometimes done, in a sort of parade, when the young fellows seem rather to glory in having such diseases, but let every soldier be introduced, as it were, solemnly into the surgeon's room and examined on the understanding that it is a very, very serious matter. For my part, therefore, I see no objection to the Act; on the contrary, I think it was a beneficent Act, and I cannot help on this occasion expressing the hope that at no distant period it may be reintroduced into this country. (Cheers.) But, then, it is said, supposing it has worked well in this country, it is a failure in India. No doubt in India it has not done all that was expected of it. One of the reasons is the short-service system already alluded to. And to these must be added, as a most important element, the imperfect and irregular operation of the Acts. With regard to this point I have important evidence from Surgeon-General Payne, who had medical control of the working of the Acts in Calcutta from 1869 to 1879, the former year being that in which the Acts came into operation. The Cantonment Act, which was introduced in 1864, did not apply to Fort William, but to the civil population of Calcutta only, and so far acted only in an indirect way on the health of the soldiers. In a despatch to the India Office, Surgeon-General Payne writes: "The garrison of Fort William in 1872 illustrated the worst effects of a newly-arrived regiment bringing disease to those sections of the town which the soldiers frequent. At the close of 1871 the men of the 19th Foot left Calcutta, after two years' residence, almost without a case of syphilis. The headquarters' wing of the 114th Regiment took its place, coming from Cawnpore, where the men had suffered heavily from the disease. They were not inspected on their arrival. From their arrival to the end of April there were many cases admitted into hospital. . . . By the end of April the mischief was arrested. . . . The health of the garrison forcibly exemplified all that has been said, here and elsewhere, of the effect of the movement of troops. I had ventured to predict that the year 1873 would find the 114th Regiment as free from disease as their predecessors had become. The event fully justified the prediction, and, on the arrival of the 3rd Buffs, our former experience was utilized by the regimental authorities. There were 12 or 13 venereal cases under treatment at the time, and, at my suggestion, an inspection of the entire regiment was held. It resulted in the detection and removal to hospital of between 30 and 40 cases, and no new cases occurred for months afterwards." This seems to me to be most important evidence. (Hear, hear.) There is still further evidence given by the same authority that within the first four years during which the Act was in operation under his supervision, taking cases of primary disease originating in Calcutta, the percentage was reduced from 7 per cent. to 1·4 per cent. That is exceedingly important evidence as to what, even in India, can be done if the Acts are energetically and properly worked. (Hear, hear.) I am aware that in remote districts there may be especial difficulties; but I was pleased beyond measure to hear Lord Roberts state that, in his opinion, without anything which can be fairly construed as a direct encouragement of vice, measures might be taken in the cantonments which would have the effect of enormously diminishing the evil of which we are speaking. I trust, therefore, my lords, whether the enquiry which the noble lord has requested be instituted or not—and I confess I myself would rather see it deferred, for fear it might appear, as in the case of the Vaccination Commission, to hold out the idea that the case was not sufficiently proved—(cheers)—I trust, whether the enquiry be instituted or not, that this House will give distinct encouragement to the Government of India to persevere in the good and Christian course on which they have entered. (Cheers.)

Lord PLAYFAIR said that the speech of his distinguished friend who had just addressed the House was very important from a medical point of view. But he thought that Lord Lister did not give sufficient importance to the fact that, unless the new regulations were made sufficiently consonant with public feeling, it would be impossible, without a great struggle, to carry them into effective operation either in this country or in India. (Hear, hear.) Public opinion was now rising very much in favour of effective measures being taken to remove what was a great scandal to the nation. The evidence was perfectly conclusive as to the increase, not only in extent, but in malignancy, of the disease among our troops in India; and the public should never forget what a disease it was. It was a disease which the great specialist Ricord described as "the most terrible contagion which ever threatened mankind." It was terrible to the sufferer and to his descendants. Ordinary diseases exhausted their ill-effects on the person attacked by them; but syphilis descended to innocent children of parents tainted by it, either by direct transmission or by the degeneration of their constitution. Other diseases which followed from it on account of degeneracy of constitution had very much increased. The public should satisfy themselves on one point—it had been conclusively proved that the disease could be controlled by hygienic agencies. Those agencies had failed of recent years, because they had not been properly and efficiently carried out. The disease, in its major form, was prevented to a great extent in all the armies of European nations, while England was the only nation which allowed it to be dangerously prevalent among its soldiers, both at home and abroad. When the German army had succeeded in reducing the ratio of syphilis to 5½ per 1,000, was it not scandalous that the English army at home should have a ratio of about 100 to the 1,000 and in India of at least 175 per 1,000? (Hear, hear.) No doubt service in an Eastern country rendered it more difficult to repress the disease; but other countries had to encounter these difficulties. The Dutch soldiers serving in the East Indies suffered from the minor forms of venereal disease to a large extent, but they kept under control the major form of the disease, which prevailed only to one-third of the extent among our British troops. The Dutch army in the East Indies formerly had a ratio of syphilitic disease among their troops of 47 in 1,000, but this had been reduced in recent years to 37 per 1,000; while the English army in India had a ratio of 175 to 1,000, and this had increased in recent years to 259 per 1,000. It was obvious that our bad administration of hygienic measures was responsible for the state of the British army in India. Racial differences, no doubt, largely influenced the susceptibility of individuals in regard to the disease; but even these could not explain why, for all forms of venereal disease, the Japanese army had the low ratio of 34 to 1,000, while the British army in India had 500 to 1,000. The United Kingdom might justly boast that since 1845 it had led the way in all sanitary reforms, and had greatly improved the health and lessened the mortality of all classes of the population. There was only this exception—that in regard to this one class of diseases, the most repulsive and horrible of all, England stood now far behind all European nations. In the report of the departmental committee the following statement was made:—"Improved sanitation has had the very greatest effect upon every disease other than venereal; this alone has not only been unchecked in recent years, but has increased to an extent which is appalling and disastrous." Up to 1887 the sanitary regulations in India, though they were inefficient to extirpate this class of diseases among our soldiers, were at least effective in preventing their increase. But in 1887 Parliament intervened, and since then the obnoxious regulations had been repealed by successive Secretaries of State for India, but no new powers had been given to the military authorities to apply more efficient sanitary measures. There was no want of knowledge as to how the disease could be prevented. There were moral means of prevention, and there were physical means, both excellent when worked in co-operation; but unfortunately they had drifted into a sharp antagonism. (Hear, hear.) The religious and moral agencies had tried to impress upon the soldier the heinousness of the sin which led to the disease. Lord Roberts had described the measures which had been adopted to remove soldiers from temptation by establishing reading rooms and regimental workshops, while various means of occupation and recreation had been furnished. Societies for promoting temperance and for repressing vice had done good work in the

army. The fruit of these combined efforts were seen in the general elevation of morality in the army. Drunkenness and crime had greatly lessened among our soldiers in India. Yet all those social and moral agencies had failed to stay the increase of venereal diseases among our troops. They had failed as completely as the weakened sanitary regulations in use since 1887. The basis of all hygienic measures for preventing the spread of contagious diseases was isolation of the diseased from the healthy, and the application of curative methods to the diseased person. Parliament had in recent years enforced notification of contagious diseases such as cholera, smallpox, scarlet fever, and typhoid from the individual patient to the sanitary authority, which was empowered to see that isolation was effective, either at the home of the patient or in the hospital. This law of notification and isolation had been extended to our Army in India and prevailed in cantonments; but, though applicable to zymotic diseases generally, was no longer applied to the foul and malignant disease of syphilis. Yet it had been known for centuries that isolation was the only effective means of preventing the extension of this disease. Thus, in 1497 Edinburgh was violently attacked by syphilis, then called "grandgore," and the Privy Council of Scotland ordered the magistrates of Edinburgh to collect, on a certain day, all the diseased women, accompanied by their doctors, on the sands of Leith, where bouts were provided to transport both women and doctors to the island of Inchkeith—(laughter)—and there the women had to remain until the disease was cured on pain of being branded. This was high-handed isolation, but could only be partially successful, because the diseased men do not seem to have been isolated. Compulsory isolation, as now applied by law to zymotic or filth diseases, ought still more rigorously to be applied to venereal diseases. The military authorities, in regard to venereal diseases, should at least have as full powers as those given by the Diseases Notification Act. They should therefore be enabled to discover the cases of disease and to enforce the effective isolation of the diseased. There was a fear that the active interference of the State in grappling with the evils of a dangerous immoral trade, overtly carried on among our soldiers, implied a State recognition and approval of the trade. Recognition there certainly was, but approval was not implied in making regulations for the supervision of any dangerous trades. (Hear, hear.) At one time the Church was intrusted with regulating the immoral traffic in cities, but, though that involved recognition, it did not imply approval of notorious sin. In 1430 the Bishop of Winchester was charged by Ordinance to regulate and supervise eighteen houses of bad repute which stood on Bankside, Southwark, but this involved no Episcopal approval of the immoral traffic carried on in them. The Secretary of State for India, in his despatch of March 27th, had been careful to point out how much more efficient regulations could be applied in the cantonments in India without recurring to those measures which offended the public feeling in this country. If the societies for the prevention of vice were satisfied with these assurances they might aid the authorities very much by co-operating with them in their renewed endeavours, by every form of moral and hygienic agency, to remove the national scandal of our Army being the worst in Europe in regard to those loathsome diseases. The case was urgent and admitted of no delay. But the resolution proposed by the noble lord for a new enquiry would certainly be used by the opponents of hygienic measures as a justification for further postponing the more active measures promised in the despatch of the Secretary of State for India. So far as they went they were good proposals, though they did not go far enough, but if they were effective in removing the antagonism and securing the co-operation of the religious and moral societies which acted on public opinion in 1887 and forced the military authorities to weaken their administration of the regulations, he looked with hope to this new effort of the Government. If it was met in the manly spirit of co-operation indicated in the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury he would have great hopes of the success of the new measures indicated in the despatch. Hygienic prevention and moral prevention could well work in co-operation. He trusted that this would be the spirit which might in future prevail among the societies which arose under different conditions. At present, if he might judge from circulars which he had received in the last few days, they still seemed inclined to retain their old position of antagonism to hygienic regulations. He did not want them to alter their attitude of watchfulness;

but why should they not join their means of moral improvement with those of hygienic improvement, and help the authorities to restrain a frightful disease which was rapidly increasing in extent and malignancy among our soldiers in India? (Hear, hear.)

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: My lords, after the able speeches which you heard on Friday night from Lord Roberts and from the noble earl who brought the subject forward, and after the admirable way it was supported to a great extent by the Primate, I am hardly justified in intruding myself on such an occasion, having no further personal responsibility with matters connected with the army. But, having been so long at the head of the army, and having had for many years the opportunity of seeing the effects that existed before all those regulations were done away with, I must entreat of you to reflect well before you come to any resolution adverse to what has been brought to your notice by the noble earl. No one can have any adequate idea of the miserable results produced by the doing away of the regulations, especially in India. But I do not take up this matter from the army point of view, though that is of the greatest importance; I take it up from the civil point of view. We must always bear in mind that a large number of young men now annually return from India; and if they return in a condition to propagate this horrible disease in the civil community at home, the misery caused is untold. (Hear, hear.) Therefore we ought to lose no time in putting a stop, if possible, to the laxity, or whatever you like to call it, with which this subject has been treated of late years, particularly in India. I have a very strong opinion also that morality would not suffer. I firmly believe, from all I have heard, that many of those poor creatures who formerly suffered, and propagated this miserable disease, absolutely gave up their immoral life as a result of the cure which they had obtained in good hospitals, and because they found that if they continued their immoral life they would become altogether outcasts of the world. The result was that they gave up this very vice which everybody wishes to see modified. I say modified, because the most rev. prelate will forgive me for saying that you must change human nature before you can get rid of the vice altogether. (Hear, hear.) I am afraid even the bench of bishops, with his lordship at their head, cannot effect that object, or any other object but the mitigation of this vice. I support most fully and entirely the views which were expressed by the most rev. prelate, but the difficulty is to find the means of effecting his object. Lord Roberts has told you, and I tell you also on the part of the whole army, that we do everything, and have done everything of late years, to facilitate and make acceptable the barrack life of the soldier. We have introduced—and the noble marquis near me will, no doubt, if he speaks, express the same view—every sort of recreation and useful occupation and interest that can ameliorate the monotony of barrack life. This has been gradually and is daily being introduced into our service, and more particularly in India, where it is more required even than at home. A great improvement in the soldiers' condition and the soldiers' sentiments has been produced as a result, and it is felt by the military authorities that the more this policy is carried out and the more we do in that direction the better. This will have a great effect, I hope, in time, in producing morality to a greater extent than it exists at this moment among her Majesty's forces. I do not believe myself that you can absolutely look forward to any very great mitigation of this miserable condition of things unless you treat the subject fully and fairly on its own merits, or, rather, I should say, its demerits. The demerits are so plain that I cannot conceive that anybody who has right or proper feeling, or delicacy of feeling, can have any doubt on that subject. I can only tell your lordships that this subject is of such enormous importance to the civil population that not a day, not an hour, should be lost in introducing stringent and decided regulations, and every effort should be made to put a stop to what is really a most miserable and cruel condition of things. Imagine the civil population infected with this miserable disease! A great many of the men who come home are, I know, very seriously diseased. You cannot control them; they go into the civil population; you do not even know what becomes of them; and then they propagate this very horrible disease. This is owing to the laxity, if I may say so, with which we have looked after our men in India. The disease can certainly be controlled in India, though it may not be easy to control it elsewhere. One of the reasons why it is not

controlled as it ought to be is, I am sorry to say, that the medical inspections referred to by the noble lord are not carried out now as they used to be. (Hear, hear.) In my early days there was no sort of hesitation in regard to the matter; nobody questioned for a moment that every individual soldier should be inspected once a week. I do not see why this disease is to be treated on a different footing from smallpox or any other disease the subjects of which are immediately taken to the hospital and there dealt with. Without inspection we are not in a position to deal with this disease because we know nothing about it. Nobody of either sex would confess to such a disease unless there are means of finding out that it exists. I for one was always strongly of opinion that medical inspection was essential, not only in the interests of the army, but of the population at large. I regret, therefore, more than I can say, that I was not able to carry out those views which I personally entertained. I think we ought to lose no time in the matter. I quite agree with the noble lord that if it is found essential to go further into details it should be done, but I should hardly think it was, because I think we have details enough to satisfy any reasonable mind. (Cheers.) If there is a necessity for that, be it so, but do not on that account delay for an hour or a moment the regulations, rules, and orders which are required. If they are not found strong enough I hope there will be no hesitation in going further, even although it is distasteful I know in many quarters. It is a most fearful thing that the great population of this country should be in danger of infection and that the happiness of the generations to come should also be endangered. (Hear, hear.) It is not only to the present but to the future that we must look, and there will be much danger to future generations if something very serious is not done. I have no idea what her Majesty's Government intend to do, but I hope they mean absolutely to stick to their determination to go on with those regulations which they have already desired to carry out in India. If those are not found sufficient to mitigate the disease I hope they will go on with stronger regulations and stronger rules, progressing with caution and prudence, and without hurry, in order to reduce it in every way that is possible. In the meantime, whilst doing that, everything that can be done should be done to prevent the young men shut up in the barracks from being induced to overlook that morality which we would all like to see not only in the army, but in every portion of her Majesty's dominion. (Cheers.)

THE BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL thought that the periodical examination of the soldiers which had been alluded to might remove one of the objections to which importance had been attached—namely, that there should be no difference of treatment between the men and the women. He suggested that where regiments had deteriorated in morality penalties should be inflicted on the colonels of the regiments personally. If those who were under him as a head-master or a bishop deteriorated, it would be quite right if he were removed from his office. He had lived in a garrison town, and he knew how much the character of a regiment depended upon its colonel. He did not believe any good would be done by further inquiry. (Hear, hear.) In India it might be possible, without moral objection, to have periodical examination insisted upon of all women engaged in the different cantonments, but he trusted the revival of the denunciation of those who had communicated disease would never be sanctioned. He appealed strongly against the revival of the Acts themselves, but he would give his hearty support to any measures of hygienic or sanitary reform.

THE MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE: My lords, the action of the military authorities has been so frequently referred to during this debate that I think your lordships will expect that I should say one or two words as to the manner in which the War Department regards the proposal contained in the Secretary of State's despatch. My lords, we entirely accept the policy of the despatch, and we believe that policy is applicable to the British army not only in India, but in whatever part of the Empire it may be found. Lord Lister, in his very weighty speech just now, expressed the opinion that the new cantonment rules which might be issued under these instructions might possibly not go far enough to be effectual. That may possibly be the case, but I am able to tell him that similar laws were enforced not long ago in India, and those best able to judge anticipated for them a success which, of course, they were not permitted to achieve, because they were repealed within a few months of the date when they were first enacted.

It should be remembered that these rules rely not only on the compulsory power of detaining in hospital all women who have been ascertained to be diseased, but upon the prospect that these poor creatures, when they find hospitals are open for them, and that in those hospitals they are kindly and humanely treated, will gladly, and of their own accord, go into hospital, rather than submit to the other alternative, which, as you are aware, is that of expulsion from the cantonments. But, my lords, whether I am right or wrong as to this, I would venture to insist that in cases of this kind, profiting by our former experience of the question, we shall be wise if we lay ourselves open to the charge of lagging a little behind public opinion, rather than to the charge of going far ahead of it. (Hear, hear.) I do not propose to detain you with any reference, or, at any rate, any lengthened reference, to the statistics which have been brought forward. My lords, in this matter, statistics may be used for two purposes. They may be used in order to show that the Acts to which reference has been made were or were not successful in achieving the desired object, or, again, they may be used merely for the purpose of showing that the existing situation is so serious as urgently to demand effectual action on the part of the Government. With regard to the statistics as far as they illustrate the effect of the now repealed Acts and regulations, I readily admit that they require reading with great care and discrimination before anyone can say with absolute confidence that the case is proved by the figures, because, as has been said, the case is greatly complicated by the fact that the conditions of service in India have been greatly varied by the introduction of short service, which obviously renders the soldiers of the army much more liable to this great danger. There is another complication in the statistical view of the case, which is this—that from time to time these diseases are reclassified by the medical authorities, and I have always found in all medical statistics persons are apt to be misled owing to the fact that the same ailment was described at different times under different names. Then, as Lord Roberts told you, there is a question whether these Acts were always administered in a proper and intelligent manner, or whether, as he evidently supposed, they were frequently given effect to in a very fitful and blundering fashion. I say, therefore, I have no wish to insist too much on the value of statistics in order to show the efficacy of the repealed Acts. But when we come to the value of the figures as denoting the growth and serious condition of things in the British army, I think we may say without hesitation that the case is an overwhelming one. (Cheers.) It appears not to be disputed that out of a small army of 70,000 soldiers in India in the year 1894 no less than 20,000 had been affected by the graver form of this disease; nor is it denied that of the whole of that force only a minority of 37 per cent. had been altogether free from disease of one kind or another. These figures appear to me to constitute an overwhelming case. (Hear, hear.) I have often heard complaint that the interests of the army at home were subordinated to the interests of the army in India. My lords, we hear as cheerfully as we can the sacrifice which the home army is called upon to make for the sake of the Indian army, but I think we have a right to say it is not part of the contract that men whom we land in India, and who are the very flower of the British army, should, owing to our own neglect, come back to us withered and tainted by this horrible complaint. We haggle with the Treasury over the price of two or three battalions; but here is an enemy which literally decimates the British army and places men *hors de combat*, not by hundreds, but by thousands. And the case is equally serious when we come to consider the injury sustained by the civil population. We have it here that of the 13,000 men who year by year come back to this country from India only about 5,000 are altogether clean and free from diseases of this kind. There is another point which has, I think, been fairly established, and that is that the present condition of the law in India has become intolerable. I am tempted to say that the present condition of these regulations in India—regulations which, as your lordships have heard, treat this particular form of disease as privileged, as a form of disease not to be treated as other infectious and contagious diseases are—I am tempted to say that the condition of these regulations is a rather instructive example of the results of dealing with important questions of this kind precipitately and under the influence of strong emotion or excitement. (Hear, hear.) I hope we shall avoid that error upon the

present occasion. Your lordships probably recollect the history of this case. Some ten years ago the circular to which the right rev. prelate referred—a most improperly worded and unfortunate circular—came to light. A great shock was given to the public mind, and thereupon a resolution of the House of Commons was passed. That resolution was peremptory in its terms, but very vague in its language. It was virtually an Act of Parliament, although it underwent none of that close discussion and detailed examination which under the practice of Parliament all Acts undergo. The Government of India endeavoured loyally to give effect to that resolution, but subsequent enquiries disclosed the fact that in many districts the local military authorities, instead of keeping carefully within the terms of the instructions which had been issued to them, to some extent disregarded those instructions. There was another outbreak of indignation at the thought that the rules which had been agreed upon, after careful discussion, between the India Office and the Government of India should be thrown into the waste-paper basket, and an Act was imposed upon Lord Elgin's Government—an Act which was, to the best of my belief either mischievous or useless, and which was greatly resented by the unofficial members of Lord Elgin's Council. I mention these things, not because I have any desire to rake up old controversies—we can occupy ourselves in a better way than that—but because I trust we shall avoid in the future the kind of mistakes which we have committed in the past. I certainly do not impute to those who differ from us anything but the most absolute honesty and sincerity of purpose. Nor, on the other hand, can I find the heart to blame very seriously those unfortunate soldiers who, desiring to shield their men from the consequences of this terrible scourge, found themselves with one foot across the very badly defined frontier which Parliament had laid down for their guidance. (Hear, hear.) The noble earl who brought this matter forward suggested to your lordships that further enquiry might be desirable. For my part I have heard with great pleasure the statement made by successive speakers that there is no occasion for such enquiry, and I trust that it will not be pressed for. As far as I am able to judge, except among a few extreme partisans, there is no difference of opinion either as to the facts or as to the direction in which we should look for a remedy. As to the state of the case outside India, there is already in the published statistics a very sufficient account of the health of the troops at the different colonial stations. The figures show that British troops suffer more than the troops of any foreign country. They also show, I think, that Lord Playfair was correct in his statement that there must be something radically wrong in the manner in which this question is dealt with in the stations abroad occupied by British troops as compared with foreign stations occupied by the troops of other countries. I will mention two cases. At Singapore compulsory examination was abolished on January 1st, 1888, and immediately afterwards 200 women left the Lock hospital in a state of disease. An enormous increase in the admission rate and "constantly sick" rate immediately commenced, and has gone on ever since. The rates of admission have about trebled since 1887. For example, in 1885, 1886, and 1887 the rates were 131, 134, and 197 per 1,000; since then they have varied from 400 to 600 per 1,000. The other case, to which I will refer by way of contrast, is the case of Malta. There, owing to the strenuous opposition of the local press and non-official members of the Council of Government, the repealing ordinance was rejected, and a local Act remains in force. The admission and constantly-sick rates have shown remarkable fluctuations, but in the last few years have averaged less than one-half of the rates at Gibraltar, the average of admissions being about 150 per 1,000. With regard to the home Army, we have figures for the fourteen stations where the Acts were in force, and, comparing these figures with the statistics relating to fourteen other large stations, they again appear to show conclusively that, whereas while the Acts were in force the protected stations enjoyed comparative immunity from these diseases, after the repeal of the Acts the non-protected and the protected stations became very much on a par. I have heard the suggestion that the practice followed in foreign countries might be enquired into. I doubt very much whether any enquiry into the manner in which these questions are dealt with in foreign countries would be of great advantage to us. The comparative immunity enjoyed by the armies of foreign countries is, of course, notorious; but so is the fact

that foreign armies differ in many essential particulars from the British Army, and also the fact that foreign Governments are allowed to do many things which the Government of this country would never be permitted to do. I cannot see that any comparison between an army recruited by voluntary enlistment and a conscript army, between an army recruited from many different classes of society and an army which is recruited entirely from one class of society—and that a class in which you cannot expect to find the highest level of education or the greatest self-restraint—I cannot bring myself to believe that such a comparison would really be very instructive. (Hear, hear.) I entirely agree with what was said by the right rev. prelate when he told the House that he trusted that in this country we should never introduce a system lending itself to those practices of police espionage and police restraint, which may perhaps be tolerated abroad, but which, I am convinced, the people of this country would never tolerate. I would prefer to consider what is practicable here—given the conditions of our army and the conditions of British society—rather than take a leaf out of the book of any foreign country. With regard to the despatch of the Secretary of State, I hope your lordships will observe that we do not by any means limit our proposals to the mere re-enactment of these cantonment rules. The despatch indicates very clearly the directions in which other remedies may possibly be found. Let me in particular call attention to the suggestion that a larger measure of control may be desirable over the disorderly population which frequents not only the cantonments themselves, but the country immediately adjoining cantonments. I have always heard it said, and I believe with truth, that many of the apparently unaccountable outbreaks of this disease at certain stations in India have been due, not to the intercourse of the men with the women ordinarily dwelling in the cantonments, but with vagrant, nomad people who have been hanging about the rough ground often to be found outside the limits of the station, and who in many cases have beyond all question been the means of introducing disease of the most dangerous kind into the cantonments. I am also not without suspicion that even in this country a little more vigilance might be usefully exercised over the persons who frequent barracks, and also perhaps over some of the lower public-houses and other places frequented by soldiers. But that is a matter as to which I am not yet prepared to make a positive statement. As to our dealings with the soldier himself, it has been pressed upon us by more than one speaker that we should deal equally with the two sexes. That is, so far as the limits of possibility allow it, the principle upon which the proposed practice is founded. We consider that it is our duty to prevent any person who is notoriously diseased from continuing to spread that disease, and, as a matter of fact, the soldier, if he conceals the fact that he is suffering from disease of this kind, is detained in hospital until he has recovered his health. A suggestion was made by his Royal Highness and another speaker that we should do well to revert to the old practice of periodically examining men. (Hear, hear.) I have discussed that proposal with many high authorities, and I am bound to tell your lordships that the conclusion to which I am disposed to arrive is that this practice of regular inspection did not produce the desired effect, and that it was, on the contrary, regarded, and rightly regarded, by the men as a brutalising and degrading practice. It is a practice which has gradually disappeared, and I confess that I should be extremely sorry to see it re-introduced. I need not dwell on the suggestion in the despatch that no pains should be spared in order to increase the comfort and decency of the soldier's life in barracks. As to that there is no difference of opinion. Large sums of money have been spent in India, in some measure due to the personal influence of Lord Roberts, on regimental institutes; and his Royal Highness is aware that there has been a very large expenditure at home on recreation establishments in which the men are given every facility for interesting and amusing themselves in the hope that these influences may tempt them away from the low associations in the midst of which they so often contract these diseases. I cannot resume my place without saying a word in reply to the moving appeal made on Friday to your lordships by the most reverend prelate. The most reverend prelate earnestly entreated us to approach this question not merely from the standpoint of the health and the fighting efficiency of the troops, but from the higher standpoint of religion and morality. The most reverend prelate suggested, I think, that there was a time when the mili-

tary authorities cared only for the effect of immoral living on the efficiency of the men entrusted to them, that they were indifferent to immorality in itself, if they did not actually encourage it. I doubt whether there has ever been a time when you would have found an English commanding officer so cynical as to tell you that, provided his men were sound in mind and limb and able to turn out in an efficient condition for service in the field, it was a matter of indifference to him whether in their private life they were the greatest ruffians and blackguards in the world. But this I can certainly say, that at the present time there is the strongest possible feeling among the commanding officers that all pains should be taken to raise the moral tone of the men for whom they are responsible. (Hear, hear.) I cannot resist bringing to your lordships' notice one little piece of evidence in confirmation of what I have said, upon which I came almost by accident, and which I need not say was not provided with any idea that this discussion was to take place. I hold in my hand a memorandum recently issued by the general officer in command of the troops in Cape Colony. This is what General Goodenough writes:—"Sensual indulgence is a breach of the law of every religion. It is also a violation of the natural laws conducing to health. . . . It seems the clear duty of commanders in every grade to lead men to a mode of life which will enhance their self-respect and keep them from physical deterioration; and it is to be believed that, among other means, advice, guidance and a certain amount of plain speaking, which is not derogatory and need not degenerate into coarseness, will undoubtedly have their effect in inducing by degrees a better state of things than now prevails. The General therefore wishes to enlist the aid of commanding officers and of all under them in the endeavour to raise the tone of feeling and opinion in the several commands through the exercise of this advice, guidance and plain speaking." (Hear, hear.) Those views are, I believe, the views entertained by every thoughtful commanding officer in the army. Although it is idle to suppose that we can expect all these young soldiers shall lead immaculate lives, I do sincerely hope that the result of efforts like these will be, after a while, distinctly to raise the tone of the private soldier in the British Army. Working on these lines, and supported as I trust we shall be by both sides in this discussion, I hope we shall be able to mitigate in some way the cruel suffering which the unchecked course of these terrible diseases have brought upon both the military and the civil population of these islands. (Cheers.)

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I was extremely glad to hear the noble marquis begin his observations by saying that it was desirable to proceed in this matter with caution; and he referred in support of that view to the history of these enactments during the past few years. It so happened that it unfortunately fell to my lot, when I was Secretary of State for India, to deal with the then state of the law in India. The noble marquis referred to the resolution passed by the House of Commons in 1888, and he said that it was not very precise. I am sorry to say that it seems to me to have been only too precise. The words of the resolution are: "Any mere suppression of measures for compulsory examination of women or for lessening and regulating prostitution in India is insufficient, and the legislation which enjoins, authorises or permits such measures ought to be repealed." That is a very distinct resolution indeed, and so it must have been felt by the noble viscount (Lord Cross), because he issued peremptory instructions that the terms of this resolution should be conformed to by the Government of India. When I returned to the India Office there was a strong remonstrance put before the Government against the state of things then prevailing in India, and it was stated that, although these instructions had been given, they had not been fully carried into effect. I felt myself then simply bound by the resolution of the House of Commons and the instructions which had been given. It was perfectly idle to suppose that we, as a Government, could have procured a reversal of that resolution. In point of fact, therefore, it remained binding upon us. It was peculiarly distasteful to me to have to deal with the matter, because I was always, in principle, in favour of stringent measures for the prevention of this horrible disease. But I conceived that I had no alternative except to loyally see that the resolution of the House of Commons, adopted as it had been by the Government, should be carried into effect. We made an inquiry, and the result was to show that the instructions given by the noble viscount had not been carried into effect. I

was greatly impressed by the fact that Lord Roberts, who naturally felt a great desire that measures should be taken effectively for repressing the disease, came to the conclusion that to a certain extent the instructions had not been followed. That was the state of things which led to the repeal of the regulations. I must confess there was one circumstance which diminished our regret, and it was the uncertainty which certainly existed as to whether the original regulations had been really successful. I do not base that on any view of my own, but upon the best authority which could possibly be quoted on the subject—namely, the Army Sanitary Commission. This Commission is a body with ample means of knowing the state of health of the army, and is a most competent body to advise on all these subjects, and it acknowledged that during the years when prostitution in cantonments was to some extent placed under restriction there was a lessening of venereal disease. And then follows this important sentence: "In fact, we pronounce the efforts to protect the men by the measures introduced for this purpose to have been failures." That was what I had before me; and naturally, seeing what had been resolved by Parliament and the extreme hostility shown to the Acts, and having a report of this kind before me, I felt much less compunction in taking the course which I felt it my duty to take as Secretary of State. This is not a question of arguing whether the regulations were or were not sufficient for the purpose; what we have before us is the simple fact that there is a frightful amount of disease in the army, and that it is our absolute duty to take any measures we can devise for diminishing such disease. That is the case before us, and it is not at all profitable to argue as to the statistics of the past, except in this way—that we must not shut our eyes to the fact that it is not merely good intentions, but that measures effective for the purpose should be devised. (Hear, hear.) I cannot help thinking, notwithstanding what we have heard from the medical authorities, that there is a real, substantial, inherent difficulty in really devising these effective measures. We must not be disappointed, therefore, if the steps now taken by the Government should not have all the effect which we should desire. If upon experience that should prove to be the case, I trust we shall not hesitate to take measures still more stringent. (Cheers.) This is not a matter which we can afford to trifle with. Differing from those who have conscientiously opposed this measure, I hold the opinion that, not only in the interests of the health of the army and of the civil population, but even of morality itself, it is our duty to endeavour to diminish this evil, because it cannot be moral to leave a terrible disease to ravage a population upon any principle or pretext whatever, if you have any means to repress it. (Cheers.) Possibly we may have to adopt means extremely distasteful, and which one would rather not have recourse to; but you have to choose between two things—either to allow the mischief to continue or to adopt whatever measures are found absolutely necessary in order to diminish, though not, perhaps, entirely to prevent it. The facts repel the view that if you take measures to prevent the disease you remove one of the strongest preventives to vice. As a matter of fact, the disease does not prevent the vice, and therefore the argument, even if you admit it, is worth nothing. The most reverend prelate insisted on the importance of taking every step to improve the morality of the soldier. Everyone will cordially concur with the most reverend prelate; but do not let us shut our eyes to the fact that the history of mankind proves that by no such means will you produce any great or far-reaching effect. I insist upon that, not from any cynical view, but because you must look facts in the face, and it is no use to imagine that you will by any means of that kind really be able to grapple with the problem. Only one word more. I think all who have heard this most interesting debate, and who hold the opinions which I imagine are generally held here with regard to the necessity for the prevention of this disease, must have seen with great satisfaction the change of feeling which has come across the country upon the subject. It is a matter, I think, of the greatest moment that you will in this respect carry the country heartily with you. (Cheers.) If the Government proceed cautiously and wisely, and if the Government of India see that nothing is done beyond the actual necessity of the case, I believe that not only will the country support the Government in the measures which it has now taken, and which I heartily hope may be themselves successful, but also in any further measures which they may find indispensable for the object in view. (Cheers.)

Lord CHARINA, as one of the oldest regimental officers in the House, having had the honour to command a battalion in India as well as in the East Indies, and also one on the Home service, felt bound to say a few words. The most reverend prelate advocated as a means of promoting morality in the army an increase of married soldiers in a battalion. Presumably the most reverend prelate would not imagine that if a regiment of 1,000 strong were sent to India they could provide them with 1,000 wives and supply transport for a couple of thousand children. (Laughter.) Therefore he looked upon that as an impracticable proposition. Supposing, again, 200 soldiers were allowed to marry in each battalion what would become of the remaining 800? That plan would have no sensible effect in lessening the ravages of disease. He was amazed to hear it suggested that penal results should fall upon a commanding officer in whose regiment there was a large amount of disease. No body of men were more devoted to their duty than the commanding officers of regiments. He commanded two different battalions during his considerable service in India, and he could only say that everything in the power of a commanding officer had not only been done of late during the time Lord Roberts was in command, but that the same anxiety was shown by an equally gallant and able soldier, the late Lord Strathnairn. (Cheers.) Having regard to all that was done for the soldier in the way of libraries and the provision of reading-rooms and every sort of games, instruction in trades, and the system of regimental gardens, he was at a loss to know how moral suasion could be carried out more than had been done by officers commanding battalions. He was convinced that the new regulations would be utterly futile. He hoped that the clergy would in this matter rather follow the lead of the Primate than that of another right rev. prelate to whom the House had listened that evening. (Laughter.)

The EARL OF DUNRAVEN said that, as her Majesty's Government did not think that the enquiry which he asked for would be wise, he should withdraw his motion, though with considerable reluctance. The last thing he wished for was that action should be delayed.

The resolution was by leave withdrawn.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Restoration of Mahārājā Zalim Singh,—Petition from Jhallawar, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

THE CHITRAL MEDAL

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Under-Secretary of State for War, when the Chitral medal would be issued, and what was the cause of the delay.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Chitral medal has been struck and has for some time past been in course of distribution in India. The cause of the delay in its issue was, as I explained in this House on the 2nd of February last, the decision to strike a new medal, instead of adding a clasp to the existing frontier medal, which involved the selection and execution of a new design.

May 18th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN MAIL CONTRACTS.

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON asked the Secretary to the Treasury as representing the Postmaster-General, whether the contract had been signed between the Government and the directors of the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company for the carriage of mails to and from India and Australia; and, if so, for what period:

And whether the Government were seeing to it that the said Peninsular and Oriental Company complied with the law as set forth in Section 210 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.

Mr. HANBURY: The Postmaster-General has not yet signed the new contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company for the carriage of mails to and from India and Australia. The contract will be for seven years. The last part of the hon. member's question should be addressed to the President of the Board of Trade.

May 20th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE INSURANCE FUND.

Mr. DILLON asked the Secretary of State for India, Would he explain under what circumstances a portion of the interest charges in connection with the Indian Midland and Bengal Nagpur Railways had now for some years been met out of the Famine Insurance Fund, in view of the fact that shortly after the creation of the Famine Insurance Fund the Government of India requested the sanction of the Secretary of State to meet certain interest charges in connection with protective railways from that fund; that Lord Cranbrook, the then Secretary of State, withheld his sanction on the ground that such a step would be a complete inversion of the object with which the fund was constituted; and that that decision was upheld by two Parliamentary Committees in 1879 and 1884 respectively.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The general policy of the Government is that to which the honourable member refers as having been supported by the Committees of 1879 and 1884, namely, that money shall be borrowed for such railways only as are likely to be so productive that the net results will cover the charge for interest on the debt incurred, and that protective railways charged on the Famine Insurance grant shall be constructed out of the revenue. In 1885, however, the Government of India found it necessary to undertake an exceptionally large scheme of railways, two of which were intended for the protection of the country against famine. The Secretary of State in Council held that the circumstances were of a special character, which could not have been contemplated by the Parliamentary Committees; and, as the Government could not themselves construct the whole of the works, and he was unwilling to delay the two urgently-needed protective lines, he authorised their construction by companies, the interest being debited against the Famine Insurance grant. When the lines came into operation, the receipts were set against the interest, and the net charge was so debited. I should add that the Indian Midland traverses some of the worst famine districts, and without its distributing power it would have been impossible to have kept the people alive in those districts during the past months.

THE "DIAMOND JUBILEE."

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the First Commissioner of Works, whether, among the members of the Colonial Services for whom seats were to be provided to view the procession on Jubilee Day, any provision would be made for members of the Indian Civil and Military Services.

Mr. AXFORD-DOUGLAS: I have promised to place at the disposal of the India Office as many seats as can fairly be allotted to that Department, and, further, to find if possible some seats for the services specially alluded to by my hon. friend. The distribution of tickets will be made by the authorities of the India Office.

"EXCHANGE COMPENSATION" ALLOWANCE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of the fact that the salaries of the European officials in Ceylon, Singapore, and Hong Kong were paid in silver currency, would he state whether any compensation allowance had been granted to them for the depreciation on silver, as had been granted by the Government of India to its European employees.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: European officials in Ceylon are at present paid half their salaries at 1s. 6d. the rupee, and in Straits Settlements and Hong-kong at 3s. to the dollar.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Controller and Auditor-General to the Government of India raised any objection to the payment of compensation allowance to the forty Indian officials whose salaries were by statute fixed in rupees:

And, whether he took any steps to stop those payments and surcharged the officers concerned; if so, upon what grounds had those payments been continued for nearly four years.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Doubts as to the technical legality of the payment of exchange compensation allowance to the officers whose salaries are fixed under statute in rupees were raised, not by the Comptroller and Auditor-General himself, but on two separate occasions by two of his accounting officers. The result of the doubts thus raised was a reference by the Government of India to the Secretary of State in Council; and, as I have already informed the hon. member, the matter is still under my consideration, with a view to the procuring of further legal opinions. The payments have hitherto been made in India under the impression, confirmed by legal advice, that they were not only equitable but legal, and until the question is finally decided it is obvious that no steps of any kind can be taken.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

Mr. M. M. BROWNAGGERS asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether there was any likelihood of the Royal Commission on the Expenditure of India completing their Report before the end of the present Session; and whether, in that case, he would give special facilities for a debate on the Report, apart from the usual discussion of the Indian Budget.

Lord G. HAMILTON, who replied, said: I am afraid there is no chance of the Report being issued in time to permit of its proper consideration by the Government before the close of the Session.

PAPER PRESENTED.

East India (Contagious Diseases) (No. 5, 1897).—Copy presented,—of Memorials addressed to the Secretary of State for India, on the subject of the Instructions contained in his Despatch of 26th March, 1897, for improving the health of British troops in India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, E.W.]

VOL. VIII.

Parliamentary Report No. 6.

JULY, 1897.

This Supplement consists of a FULL Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from May 24th to June 25th.

Imperial Parliament.

May 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petition from Yorkshire, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

May 25th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE AND THE BUDGET.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, whether, in view of the great suffering caused by the Indian famine, and the serious questions raised by it as regarded the future administration of India, the Government would bring the Indian Budget before the House at a time when a full attendance of members might be obtained.

Mr. BALFOUR: The hon. gentleman is aware that the sympathy felt in this House with the sufferings of the people India is very great, but I do not think that would necessarily produce a large audience for the discussion of the Indian Budget, whatever were the time of year selected for the debate. I believe we have an example of the Indian Budget being discussed in June, and the audience was not greater then than it is when the Budget is taken at the usual time.

ENTERIC FEVER.

Colonel WYNDHAM MURRAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether an outbreak of enteric fever had occurred among the Black Watch regiment at Subathu:

Whether the same regiment suffered severely from the same disease last summer in the same place:

Whether at that time the prevalence of the disease was accounted for by one of the reservoirs being infected with the particular bacillus which was associated with that disease, the water being found to be swarming with the characteristic microbes:

What steps had been taken in the matter since last summer; And, if all precautions had been taken, what special advantages existed at that place that it should be maintained longer as a troop station.

Lord G. HAMILTON: A fresh outbreak of enteric fever has, I regret to say occurred among the Black Watch, which arrived at Subathu on 24th March last.

A telegram from the Viceroy dated 23rd May states that eighteen cases have occurred, fourteen of which however are

believed to have been contracted on the march up from the plains. Two cases have resulted fatally.

Every possible sanitary precaution has been taken, and a thorough bacteriological examination into the cause of the disease is being made. A scheme for improving the permanent water-supply, involving the acquisition of land and springs, is being carried out; meanwhile the laying of a temporary pipe is nearly completed.

Subathu, which is 4,500ft. above the sea has a good climate, and is not usually unhealthy.

May 26th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION FROM JHALAWAR.

Restoration of Mahārājā Zalim Singh.—Petition from Jhalawar, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

May 27th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OFFICERS FOR STAFF EMPLOY.

Captain PIERCE asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was the case that by the Indian Army Regulations an officer who had passed through a two years' course at the Staff College was still kept on exactly the same footing as regards claims for staff employment as one who had merely been through the two months' garrison class and passed the usual examinations for promotion to field rank:

And whether the great majority of appointments on the Army Headquarter Staff and District Staff in India were held by officers who were not Staff College graduates; and, if so, whether he would consider the advisability of altering these regulations so as to assimilate them with those which prevailed in the Home Army, whereby preference in the giving of staff appointments would be given to Staff College Officers, thus enabling the Indian Government to profit to the full extent of the payments which it made towards the maintenance of the Staff College, and allowing it to give legitimate reward to its officers whom it encouraged to pass the course.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The selection of officers for staff employment in India is vested in the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief in India, and I am confident that in making such selection those authorities weigh carefully the merits and qualifications of all candidates, and that due weight is given to the possession of a Staff College certificate. I see no reason to interfere with their discretion, or to alter the Indian Army Regulations, which on this subject are substantially the same as the Queen's Regulations.

THE STAFF CORPS.

Sir SKYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would call upon the Government of India to make a report as to the effectiveness of the steps taken by the Indian Government in 1894 to prevent the supersession of officers of the Indian Staff Corps by those in the line by granting temporary rank to commandants and seconds in command in Native regiments.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The question of the supersession of officers of the Indian Staff Corps by those in the line is now under my consideration in connexion with a letter recently received from the Government of India.

THE CONDITION OF JHALAWAR.

Mr. W. JONES, on behalf of Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS, asked the Secretary of State for India whether 200 rifles and 50 sabres of the Deoli irregular force had been ordered to Jhalrapatan in view of the unsettled condition of the State of Jhalawar:

And, whether, seeing that the unrest which that force was intended to deal with was the result of the long period of uncertainty as to the future government of the State, would he consider the advisability of restoring His Highness the late Maharaja Rana to the Gadi, with limited powers and an experienced political agent.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received no official information as to the movement of troops to which the question refers, but assuming that such a movement of troops has occurred, I cannot admit the hon. member's view as to its cause. As regards the restoration of the Maharaja Rana, I informed the hon. member on the 21st July, last year, that the decision of the Government of India was final, and I see no reason for altering the view that I then expressed.

Mr. PARKER SMITH: Arising out of this, I wish to ask the Secretary of State for India a question of which I have given private notice—whether, in view of the misconduct of the late Maharaja Rana and the failure of heirs, he is not prepared to terminate the uncertainty by restoring Jhalawar to the original parent State of Kotah; and whether such action would not be most in accordance with Rajput customs and the desires of Rajputs.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is true that the greater part of Jhala was part of Kotah, and was ceded on the condition that in the event of the failure of heirs it should lapse to Kotah. Such an arrangement would be in accordance with treaty obligation, and not, I believe, repugnant to the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants.

ADDITIONAL LIGHTS IN THE RED SEA.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the increased shipping from India and Australia, the Government would take steps to have an adequate number of lighthouses stationed on the shores of the Red Sea.

Mr. RITCHIE: As stated in my reply to the hon. member for the South Division of Bristol, a circular has been addressed by Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople to the representatives of the Great Powers inviting their co-operation on the subject of additional lights in the Red Sea. No steps can be taken by Her Majesty's Government until the replies to these communications have been received and considered.

May 31st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE.

FURTHER PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Famine and Relief Operations).—Copy presented, —of further papers regarding the famine and the relief operations in India during the years 1896-7 [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

STAFF OFFICERS.

Colonel WYNDHAM MURRAY asked the Secretary of State for India, on what principles appointments to the staff of the army in India were made.

And, what were the numbers of staff officers employed with that army who came under the following heads respectively: Officers trained at the staff college; Officers trained by practical experience in campaigns; and, Officers without special training for staff duties.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Speaking generally, an officer is eligible for appointment to the staff in India if he has four years service, has passed the necessary examination in the native languages, has gone through the staff college, or has passed the qualifying examination laid down in Indian Army Regulations, or has proved his ability in the field. Subject to these conditions, the selection of officers for staff employ rests with the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief in India.

MILITARY OFFICERS AND THE "JUBILEE."
THE SCRAMBLE FOR FREE SEATS.

Captain NORTON asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the officers of the army in India at present on leave in England had been afforded accommodation to view her Majesty's procession on the 22nd June; and, if so, how many seats had been allotted to them.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The seats placed at the disposal of the India Office for the Civil and Military services of India have been allotted to those in this country who were considered to have the best claims without regard to the question whether they are at home on leave or otherwise.

LAND REVENUE SETTLEMENTS IN MADRAS.
IMPORTANT PAPERS WITHHELD.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would lay upon the Table of the House the proceedings of the Government of Madras of July, 1895, revising the Settlement Manual and Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue, together with the Correspondence which led to such revision.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Having communicated with the Government of India I am afraid I cannot promise to lay on the Table of the House the papers referred to in this question.

POLICE AND TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENTS.
HOW INDIANS ARE TREATED.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, on what ground Natives of India were excluded from competing in the examinations held in London and Calcutta for the higher offices in the Indian police:

And, on what grounds the House allowances, amounting in the aggregate to Rs. 90,000 per annum, granted to European and Eurasian telegraph masters and signallers in India, were withheld from Natives of India holding the same appointments.

Lord G. HAMILTON: As regard the Indian Police officers recruited in this country, it is thought, in view of the nature of their duties, to be essential that the conditions for admission to compete should be identical with those for commissions in the British Army. As regards those who are selected in India, a discretion is allowed to each separate Government, and as at present advised I see no reason to call in question the manner in which they have exercised it.

In reply to the second part of the honourable member's question, I can only say that I have no knowledge of the distinction which he alleges to be drawn between Europeans and Eurasians on the one hand, and Natives of India on the other, but I will make enquiry on the subject.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: With reference to his reply I should like to ask the noble lord whether this distinction of race is in accordance with her Majesty's proclamation of 1868. (Ministerialist cries of "oh! oh!")

No reply was given.

STAFF OFFICERS.

Captain PIRIE asked the Secretary of State for India what was the total number of appointments on the Army Head-quarter Staff, Command Staff, and District Staff of the Army in India; and the number of such appointments which were held respectively by officers P.S.O. and by officers not so qualified.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Excluding personal staff and the staff for Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, and musketry instruction, there are 142 appointments on the Staff of Army Headquarters, Army Commands, and Districts. Of these thirty-six are held by officers who have passed through the Staff College and two (2) are vacant. The rest are held by officers who have not passed through the Staff College.

Captain PRINCE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state the number of officers P.S.C. of the Indian Staff Corps who were employed on staff duty at present, also the number of the same who were not so employed, and the average period for which these latter had remained without such employment after qualifying for it by passing through the Staff College.

Lord G. HAMILTON: There are at present on the active list thirty officers of the Indian Staff Corps who have passed through the Staff College. Of these twenty are in staff employment, five are commanding their regiments, and five are employed regimentally. I cannot say how long these officers have remained without staff employment.

June 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS FROM JHALAWAR.

Restoration of Mahārāja Zalim Singh.—Two Petitions from Jhalawar, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

THE PLAGUE.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the measures of segregation of the sick, and of the healthy from plague-infected houses, recently ordered by the Government of Bombay on the recommendation of medical men from Hong Kong, were in substance urged upon that Government early in October, 1896, by the Surgeon-General with the Government of Bombay, and again in December by a committee of Bombay medical officers presided over by the late Surgeon-Major Manser;

Whether the Surgeon-General in October advised medical examination of railway passengers at Kalyan and Virar, as being more effectual than inspection at terminal stations within Bombay limits, and whether the recommendation was disregarded by the Bombay Government for three and a-half months, during which the plague was carried to numerous fresh centres of infection;

Whether, in the measures that had been adopted and the special appointments made to deal with the plague, the Bombay Government had acted in consultation with the Surgeon-General and the Sanitary Commissioner and on their recommendation;

And, whether he would lay upon the Table copies of the Report of the committee above referred to and of the recommendations of the Surgeon-General.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am unable to answer the first two questions as to the origin and pateruity of the measures taken to suppress plague in Bombay, but so far as I know there has been no divergence of opinion as to the most effective measures of stamping out the pestilence, though there may have been difference of opinion as to the possibility of enforcing off-hand drastic measures. So far as I know the Bombay Government have acted throughout in consultation with the Surgeon-General and the Sanitary Commissioner. As to the reports referred to I will enquire about them and consider whether they should be made public.

THE CLOSING OF THE MINTS.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, since the closing of the Indian mints in 1894, continuous shipments of silver had been imported into India, amounting on the average to seven crores of rupees annually, or nearly as large an amount as was imported when the mints were open;

Whether these imports were maintained in 1896-7, notwithstanding the ravages of plague and famine and the reduction of Indian exports of merchandise by nine crores of rupees;

Whether his attention had been called to the report that large consignments of the imported silver had been taken into

Native States under a rebate of duty, and after being coined had been brought back into British India and sold at a profit;

Whether, in consequence of the competition of silver imports, the fluctuations in exchange were as great as ever;

And would he explain why in these circumstances the mints were still kept closed.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Indian mints were closed on the 26th of June, 1893. For the five years previous to that date the net imports of silver into India averaged Rs. 11,249,000. For the three years since 1893-4 they have averaged Rs. 6,256,000, showing a reduction of Rs. 4,993,000 or about 44 per cent.

The net imports in 1896-97 were the smallest on record since 1881-2.

I have seen the statement as to the importation of silver into Native States in order that it may be reimported into British India at a profit; but I doubt it, as there is no provision in the law for a rebate of duty on the import of silver into Native States.

Imports of silver are not the only factors affecting exchange; and I know no reason for thinking that the fluctuations in exchange (which, I may add, have of late been very much less than those of previous years) are attributable to them.

In these circumstances there is no intention of altering the policy adopted in 1893.

THE INDIAN TARIFF ACT AND OFFICERS' EQUIPMENT.

Mr. HUDSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in cases of officers proceeding to serve in India, a part of their military equipment, such as their sword and revolver, was exempted from import duty, whereas their regimental saddle and bridle, equally necessary portions, were charged a duty.

And, whether he would enquire into the matter.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Indian Tariff Act exempts from import duty arms imported by a military officer for the purposes of his equipment. I am not aware whether an officer's saddle is similarly exempted from the general import duty of 5 per cent. *ad valorem*, but I will communicate with the Government of India on the subject.

INDIAN TROOPS AT THE "JUBILEE" CELEBRATIONS.

Mr. BARTLEY, for Mr. ISAACSON, asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether her Majesty's Government had come to any decision as to the advisability of meeting the wishes of the inhabitants of the East-end of London by allowing the colonial and Indian troops, accompanied by bands, to march through some of the main thoroughfares, decided on by the War Office, on one occasion during the Jubilee week.

Mr. BRODRICK: This is a more difficult question than appears at first sight. The Jubilee procession will involve much fatigue on the colonial and Indian troops; and it will be undesirable to give them much extra work either immediately before or after the principal day. On the other hand, the Secretary of State recognises the reasonableness of the suggestion, and he will do what he can towards complying with it.

THE PLAGUE.

Mr. HENRIK HEATON asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether he was aware that all P. and O. steamships from Australia, which took on board Bombay mails and passengers at Aden, were, in consequence of the existence of bubonic plague at Bombay, quarantined with their passengers at all the ports of call, Suez, Port Said, Brindisi, Marseilles, etc.; whether he had received petitions, signed by nearly all the passengers, by the P. and O. steamer "Parramatta," from Australia, strongly protesting against the present practice of taking the Bombay passengers at Aden on their clean ship, pointing out the further inconvenience they were subjected to by not being allowed to land at points of call, entailing delay and discomfort, and also that there was a weekly service of mails from Bombay to Aden, which might be extended to Brindisi, as it was now done fortnightly; whether the statement made by the petitioners was correct that the P. and O. Company was not responsible, as the terms of their mail contract compelled their steamers to call at Aden; and whether the Government would take action in the matter without delay.

Mr. HANBURY: The Postmaster-General understands that all Peninsular and Oriental steamships from Australia which take on board passengers from Bombay at Aden are placed in quarantine at the Egyptian ports of call. At Brindisi and Marseilles he believes there is now no regular quarantine, but only a certain medical inspection which causes little delay. The petition referred to from passengers on the steamship "Parramatta" has been received. The statement that the call at Aden is compulsory under the contracts of the Peninsular and Oriental Company with the Postmaster-General is not quite correct. The mail steamers from Australia are not obliged to call at Aden, but the Company are at liberty under the terms of the contracts to make these steamers call there and carry the mails from Bombay to Europe. A copy of the petition has been sent to the Company; but, as I stated in reply to a similar question on April 12 last, it is not in accord with the duty of the Post Office Department to take further steps in a matter which does not directly affect the mail service.

June 3rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

USUAL DELAY OF PAPERS.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India whether the usual Memorandum explanatory of the Indian Financial Statement, which had already been received from Calcutta, could be presented to Parliament immediately after the recess, so that members might be better prepared to deal with that Statement when brought before the House for its adoption.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Explanatory Memorandum is in the hands of the printers; but some of the information which I wish to include in it was only received by the last mail from India, and I fear that it cannot be distributed to members for some time yet.

THE SCRAMBLE FOR "JUBILEE" SEATS.

Captain NORTON asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could state how many seats had been allotted by the India Office to the officers of the army in India at present on leave in England.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I stated on Monday that the seats at the disposal of the India Office for the Civil and Military services had been allotted to those in this country who were considered to have the best claims, without regard to the question whether they were on leave or not. It would serve no useful purpose to give an analysis of the distribution of the tickets among the various branches of the Service.

INDIAN MUTINY VETERANS.

Mr. F. A. CHANNING asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the Royal Victorian Order was to be conferred at the Jubilee on the surviving officers who served in the Crimea and in the Mutiny, the Secretary of State would take steps also to make some special provision for the surviving privates and non-commissioned officers who served in those campaigns, and who had hitherto been excluded from pensions by the existing regulations.

Mr. BRADBICK: There is no authority for the statement as to the distribution of the Victorian Order suggested in the question. Non-commissioned officers and men who served in the Crimean or Indian Mutiny campaigns who have not pensions under the ordinary warrants are granted special campaign pensions provided they have given ten years' service and are in necessitous circumstances. It is not proposed to go further.

June 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN MUTINY VETERANS.

Captain NORTON asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether he was aware that there were some 2,000 veterans, who had served either in the Crimean War or the Indian

Mutiny, now inmates of workhouses; and whether he would consider the advisability of granting a small pension to all those in that position who were over 70 years of age.

Mr. BRADBICK: From a Return, presented this Session, it appears that in May, 1896, there were in workhouses in the United Kingdom 352 men over the age of 60 and without pension who could substantiate their claim to be discharged soldiers, although there is no evidence that they had served in the campaigns mentioned, and there is no reason to suppose that the number is now essentially different. Special campaign pensions have been awarded to Crimean and Indian Mutiny veterans of 10 years' service in 2,737 cases, at a yearly cost of £36,380. In some of these cases the pensioners remain in the workhouse by their own choice, where they are allowed to receive 2s. a week to spend. It is not intended to extend these pensions to men of less than 10 years' Army service.

Sir EDWARD GOSWELL asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Government would, during the Jubilee year, recommend to Her Majesty the Queen the bestowal of some recognition upon those officers, soldiers, and sailors who served in the Crimea or Indian Mutiny, the two leading campaigns of her Majesty's reign.

Mr. BRADBICK: All who served in the campaigns have had the medal and clasps. The services of a great number of officers engaged have been recognised by promotion and other distinctions, and of the men by the recent grant of compassionate campaign pensions, but it is not contemplated to make any general distribution of honours to the survivors at the Jubilee.

June 17th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Railways).—Copy presented—of Administration Report on the Railways in India for 1896-7, by Colonel T. Gracey, R.E., Director General of Railways [by command]: to lie upon the Table.

East India (Memorial from Desai of Badami).—Return presented,—relative thereto [Address 4th March; Sir William Wedderburn]: to lie upon the Table.

June 18th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Pensions of Forest Officers in India.—Petition of Forest Officers in India, for Alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

HIGHER EDUCATION.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India, why the Government of India maintained colleges for the higher education of Hindus and Muhammadans in India, and why no similar provision was made for Europeans and Eurasians.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of India does not maintain colleges for the higher education of Hindus and Muhammadans. The Madrassa schools were established for Muhammadans requiring to be instructed in Persian and Arabic, but the students in the College Department of those schools attend lectures in the Presidency College. With this exception Government Colleges and higher schools are open to all classes without distinction.

INDIA AND THE "DIAMOND JUBILEE."

Mr. WANKLYN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if all the detachments of Indian and Colonial troops who were visiting the United Kingdom as the guests of the Nation in connection with the Jubilee had now arrived; and, if so, whether the Colonial Office would publish a list of those Jubilee guests, setting out the localities from which they came, the name of the officer in command of each detachment, the name of the officer detailed by the Home authorities to attend

to each detachment, the total number of each detachment, the quarters where they were stationed, the arrangements which had been made for their entertainment during their visit, and any other information which might be of service to those who desired to offer hospitality to these national guests.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: It is expected that the entire Colonial contingent will have arrived at Chelsea Barracks by this evening. A list of the various detachments and of the Colonies they represent has already been published in the press, and I will consider whether any further details may advantageously be added.

Mr. WANKLYN asked the First Lord of the Admiralty if arrangements would be made for the detachments of Indian and Colonial troops who were visiting the United Kingdom as the guests of the Nation to witness the Naval Review free of charge, and to be suitably entertained upon that occasion at the expense of the Nation.

Mr. WILLIAM ALLAN asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether steps could be taken to give the Colonial troops now here an opportunity of witnessing the Naval Review.

And, whether the Railway Companies could be induced to grant free passes to those troops and the Colonial Rifle teams now here, so that they might have an opportunity of seeing the places of interest in their Mother Country.

Sir JOHN COLOMB asked the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the dependence of the Colonies upon sea communication, and having regard to the resolution of the Parliament of Cape Colony respecting contribution to the Fleet, any arrangements had been made for enabling the officers and men of the Colonial Forces now in this country to witness the Naval Review; and, if so, to state what was the nature of arrangements made.

Mr. GOSCHEN: Arrangements have been in progress from the first, for the officers and men of the Colonial forces (about 800 in number), to see the ships assembled at Spithead. A special train will be provided to take them to Portsmouth on the morning of June 30, and to bring them back in the evening. The party will be taken round the Fleet in dockyard steamer, and an opportunity will be given to them to visit certain ships. If time admits, the party will also be shown round the dockyard. Luncheon will be provided in the dockyard. The officers belonging to her Majesty's Indian forces will have an opportunity of seeing the Fleet at Spithead on Saturday, June 26. There are no troops in England.

Mr. WANKLYN: Am I to understand, from what the right hon. gentleman has said, that these detachments of Indian and Colonial troops will not be entertained on the 26th, the day of the review, and that no provision will be made for them?

Mr. GOSCHEN: I have stated the arrangements which have been made. All the Indian officers, 62 in number, will go down on the 26th, and they will be provided for as other visitors will be. The 800 troops will go down on Wednesday, the 30th, and the whole day will be appropriated to them, and they will see all the ships. (Hear, hear.) Individual attention will be paid to them, and I think they will come back realising not only the strength of the forces at Spithead, but also the enormous resources of the dockyard. (Hear, hear.) I can assure the House and the public on the point, that, in making the arrangements, we have been most anxious to give our Colonial fellow-subjects even more special attention than they would have had if they had gone down with the thousands on the day of the review. (Cheers.)

Mr. BARTLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether arrangements could be made by which the Colonial and Indian troops could visit the north of London.

Mr. BRODRICK: The time has elapsed in which it would be practicable to make arrangements for other marches through London than those already decided on.

June 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH VOLUNTEERS IN INDIA AND THE "DIAMOND JUBILEE."

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the British Volunteers in India, constituting an Imperial force of nearly 30,000 men, were invited to send

representatives to England to take part in the procession of 22nd June; and, if not, would he explain on what grounds.

Mr. G. N. CURZON, for Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The question as to what representatives of the forces in India should be sent home to take part in the procession of the 22nd June, was fully considered in communication with the Viceroy of India, and it was decided to follow the precedent of 1887, increasing the numbers of officers of the Native Cavalry, and adding representatives of the Imperial Service troops from the Native States. Neither the Native Infantry or Volunteers are represented on the present occasion.

Mr. MACLEAN: Will the right hon. gentleman explain on what grounds the volunteers were not asked, because it was a great slight to the whole of the Anglo-Indian community?

The SPEAKER: Order, order.

June 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, seeing that the capital required for carrying out the programme of Indian Railway extension for the three years ending 1897, 1898, and 1899 was estimated at rather more than 29 millions of tens of rupees (Rs. 29,000,000), and that, during the period of construction, the interest charged on that outlay must heavily increase the current financial burden, it was open to the Secretary of State in Council to revise and reduce this proposed capital outlay.

Lord G. HAMILTON: It is certainly open to the Secretary of State in Council to revise or reduce the capital outlay proposed for railway construction up to 1899; and any recommendation in that direction from the Government of India would receive my most careful consideration. But, seeing the great advantage accruing to India from the development of its railways, the importance of finding useful employment for the people in the distressed tracts and the waste attendant on a sudden change of such a policy as has been adopted, it would be with great regret that I should sanction any material reduction of the amount entered in the Budget Estimate.

INDIAN TROOPS AT THE "JUBILEE" CELEBRATIONS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, from what funds the expenses incurred in bringing men and Officers of the Indian Imperial Service Corps and Indian cavalry to England on account of the Jubilee Commemoration would be defrayed.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Native States concerned defray the expense of sending home the representatives of the Imperial Service troops, and similar charges for the Indian cavalry will be borne by Indian revenues. The charges for the reception and entertainment of both parties in England will be defrayed from the Imperial treasury.

Mr. WANKLYN asked the Under Secretary of State for War, if arrangements could be made for the detachments of Indian and Colonial troops who were our national guests to visit Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Bradford, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Belfast, Dublin, and Bristol before their departure.

Mr. W. JOHNSTON: Before the right hon. gentleman answers that question, may I ask him to give a more favourable consideration to this request, as in Belfast, certainly, the proposition would be received in the most cordial way.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: My noble friend the Secretary of State for India will answer so far as the Indian troops are concerned. But as regards the colonial troops I have to say that, considering the short time remaining before the departure of the majority of them, it would be absolutely impossible to make such arrangements as suggested by the hon. member.

Mr. WANKLYN said that he had received a telegram from Bradford stating that if the colonial troops visited that town they would be warmly received. He hoped, therefore, the right hon. gentleman would favourably consider the matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not the slightest doubt that the Indian and colonial troops would be warmly received everywhere in the United Kingdom, and I wish that their stay

were sufficiently prolonged to enable them to visit all the towns which have already intimated their desire to hospitably entertain them. It must be borne in mind that the Premiers of the self-governing colonies have visited most of these towns, and in that way have elicited the feelings of the population. (Cheers.)

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am afraid it will hardly be possible for the officers from India who formed Her Majesty's escort to visit the places mentioned by the honourable member, as their stay in this country cannot without considerable inconvenience be lengthened.

THE EARTHQUAKE IN ASSAM.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received any later information in reference to the loss of life and destruction of property by the recent earthquake in Assam and Sylhet, and whether he could give any information as to the position of the Missionaries of the Welsh Presbyterian Mission stationed in the Khasia and Jaintia Hills and in Sylhet.

Lord G. HAMILTON: We have no later information beyond what has been published in the public journals. The later telegrams give a largely reduced estimate of the probable loss of life. Nothing is known as to the position of Missionaries in the Khasia and Jaintia Hills and Sylhet, but so soon as I can obtain any authentic information I will gladly communicate it to the honourable gentleman.

THE MURDEROUS OUTRAGE AT POONA.

Sir M. M. BROWNAGGER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received any detailed information from India regarding the murder at Poona of Mr. J. Rand, of the Civil Service, and of Lieutenant Ayerst, of the Commissariat Department; and whether he could state under what circumstances and by whom these diabolical acts were committed.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have received a telegram giving more detailed information concerning this outrage, which was of a determined and premeditated character. Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst were returning from an entertainment at Government House when two men at a lonely part of the wood sprang upon the springs of their respective carriages, and fired at them with pistols. Lieutenant Ayerst was shot dead by the side of his wife, and Mr. Rand was severely wounded, but is doing well. Mr. Rand was head of the Plague Commission in Poona, and had with great skill and energy practically stamped out that pestilence. He had been violently denounced by name in some of the vernacular Press for his action in that capacity. Lieutenant Ayerst was not connected with the plague operations.

June 25th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HIGHER DEPARTMENTAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India, would he explain why, seeing that domiciled Europeans and Eurasians had not in the past proved their fitness by meritorious and faithful services for the higher departmental appointments in India, it was contemplated to reserve such appointments for Europeans educated in England, as indicated by the recent despatches of the Government of India to the Secretary of State for India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: In reply to this question I can only say that I have no doubt that the despatches to which the honourable member refers, convey correctly the intentions of Government with regard to the higher appointments to which they apply; though, in the absence of any definite reference to the despatches themselves, I cannot say whether their purport is correctly represented in the honourable member's question.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, E.C.]

VOL. VIII.

Parliamentary Report No. 7.

AUGUST, 1897.

This Supplement consists of a FULL Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from June 28th to July 23rd.

Imperial Parliament.

June 28th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RAILWAYS IN INDIA.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Secretary of State for India, what had been the amount of charge on Indian revenues over the receipts from railway working on State railways and on guaranteed railways in the last 10 years.

The hon. member also asked the Secretary of State for India, what was the original estimate of loss on the working of the Indian railway system for last year, and what was the amount of the revised estimate.

The hon. member also asked the Secretary of State for India what was the amount of capital required for carrying out the programme of railway extension in India during each of the three years 1897, 1898 and 1899; and what would be the estimated amount of interest payable thereupon during each year of the period of construction.

The hon. member also asked the Secretary of State for India what were the several dates at which the contracts with the guaranteed Indian railway companies, now involving loss to the State, could be terminated or modified.

LORD G. HAMILTON: In reply to the hon. member's four questions, I have to make the following statement.

The State and guaranteed railways of India have been worked, during the ten years 1887-97, at an average profit of 5½ per cent.; but owing to the fall in exchange a total net loss of Rx.7,781,914 on the State and Rx.8,679,557 on the guaranteed lines has accrued within that period.

The net loss in 1896-7 was estimated at Rx.2,274,300; the revised estimate was Rx.2,810,200; but according to the latest information in my possession, it is likely to be Rx.2,665,800.

The amount of capital expenditure sanctioned for each of the three years, 1896-7, 1897-8 and 1898-9, is Rx.10,174,700, Rx.10,130,000 and Rx.9,360,000, respectively; and the amount payable by way of interest in each of those years may be estimated at Rx.153,000, Rx.157,000 and Rx.150,000; against which must be set the profits to be received from such portions of the new lines as may be opened within three years.

The only two contracts with guaranteed companies, which in 1895-6 involved a net loss to the State, are those with the Great Indian Peninsular and the Madras railway companies. They terminate on the 30th June, 1900, and the 31st December, 1907, respectively.

MR. MULLICK AND THE INNS OF COURT RIFLES.

SIR CHARLES DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether he was aware that Mr. Mullick, a native of India resident in this country, after having been proposed and seconded as an eligible member of the Inns of Court Rifles, was informed by the commanding officer that, although he was personally unexceptionable, Indians being objected to by some members of the corps, the nomination must be withdrawn, and wrote to the effect that, being an Indian native gentleman, Mr. Mullick was not eligible for an English volunteer corps:

Whether he was aware that natives of India belong to the University corps in Oxford and Cambridge and to many other corps:

Whether he was aware that an opinion had been expressed by the Benchers of the four Inns of Court that the exclusion of Indians as a class was regrettable, and the commanding officer had stated publicly that there was a War Office memorandum which prohibited the enrolment of native Indians in English volunteer corps:

Whether there was any foundation for the statement of the commanding officer as to the order of the War Office:

And, whether a correspondence had taken place between the Benchers of Gray's Inn and the commanding officer of the regiment, in which they stated that the grounds on which Mr. Mullick had been declared ineligible were erroneous.

MR. BRODRICK: The admission of any subject of her Majesty to a Volunteer corps rests solely with the commanding officer. In Mr. Mullick's case it is understood that the commanding officer did not accept his nomination. There are natives of India serving in Volunteer corps, and there is no War Office document prohibiting their enrolment. Owing to a misapprehension caused by some unofficial correspondence, the commanding officer of the Inns of Court Volunteers was led to believe that natives of India could not be enrolled, but this has been corrected. It is understood that there has been some correspondence between the commanding officer and the Benchers; but the officer commanding is the only authority as to persons to be enrolled in Volunteers Corps who can be recognized.

June 29th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OPERATIONS IN THE CHIN HILLS.

Captain NORRIS asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether he could state if a medal was granted for all the operations in the Chin Hills in 1891 and 1892; and whether he was aware that many who were engaged had not received the medal.

Mr. BROADBENT: A medal was granted, but it was not awarded to columns which met with no opposition.

June 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

Brahmini, Kally,—Petition of Kally Brahmini, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

Singh, Gopal,—Petition from Udaipurwate, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

Ramsarup, Kabir Panthi,—Petition of Kabir Panthi Ramsarup, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

July 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LOANS RAISED IN INDIA.

East India (Loans raised in India).—Copy presented,—of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 31st March, 1897, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

THE OUTRAGES AT POONA.

Mr. FIRBANK asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in consequence of the murderous outrage at Poona made on Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst, the Indian Government would consider the desirability of adopting effectual means to prevent the inculcation of sedition through the Press.

Mr. MACNEILL said that before that question was answered he wished to direct attention to its wording. In the first place, the question assumed as a matter of fact that sedition had been inculcated through the Indian native press. That was an argumentative and hypothetical expression, and there was not a particle of evidence offered to support the statement. Moreover, sedition was a matter of opinion. (Laughter.) He was perfectly serious in making that observation. The question of sedition could only be determined as an issue of fact, which when answered became an issue of law. What was or what was not sedition could never be discovered until the matter was subjected to some judicial investigation. He, therefore, objected to the question, as it appeared upon the paper, being put to a minister. It was the most vicious question in a Parliamentary sense, reflecting upon a whole class of the press, that had ever been presented to the House of Commons.

The SPEAKER: The statement as to there having been a murderous outrage at Poona is a statement of fact which, if I recollect aright, has already been quoted in this House by a minister of the Crown. As regards the latter part of the question, I see nothing irregular in it. (Hear, hear.)

Lord G. HAMILTON: The police are now enquiring into the causes and circumstances of the outrage which has been recently committed at Poona. But the habitual dissemination of false intelligence and of appeals to religious animosities by a portion of the vernacular press is a matter which has for some years past received the careful attention of the Indian Government; and if the result of the present enquiry is to show that this outrage was prompted by articles of this character, the question of taking measures to prevent the encouragement of crime through the press will undoubtedly be taken into consideration. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MACNEILL: Would the enquiry be public?

Lord G. HAMILTON: If the hon. gentleman thinks that a public enquiry into a murder conspiracy of this kind would facilitate the ends of justice he stands alone in that opinion. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. DAVITT: That is a speech.

Mr. MACNEILL: I am quite content to stand alone.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: Is it not the case that under the penal code stringent punishment is provided for these incitements to crime?

The SPEAKER: Order, order. That is really arguing the

question. The noble lord has simply stated that there will be an enquiry into the matter, and that does not justify the hon. member in arguing the question that there are other means which would make it unnecessary to hold such an enquiry.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: May I explain—

The SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. gentleman is putting a question which is clearly out of order.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received copies of a joint Hindu and Muhammadan memorial, dated May 10, 1897, regarding the Poona plague administration, addressed to the Governor of Bombay by upwards of 2,000 leading citizens of Poona, and presented on their behalf by the principal Muhammadan and Hindu associations of the Deccan, giving specific instances of oppression and insult inflicted upon their families and religion, and declaring that a reign of terror had existed for the past eight weeks; whether he would state what reply was given to the petition, and what enquiry was made to test the truth of these allegations; and whether he would lay a copy of the petition and of the reply upon the Table of the House.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I had not seen a copy of the memorial to which the hon. member refers until I received one to-day from him. The measures taken at Poona to prevent the spread of the plague, which have been attended by a very remarkable amount of success, the deaths from plague having fallen from 177 per week to 7 per week within the last two months have been made the subject of much misrepresentation and exaggeration in a portion of the vernacular Press. At present I can express no opinion as to the contents of the memorial, nor have I seen a copy of the Governor of Bombay's reply; but I am confident that he has been and is most careful to confine the action of the authorities to what is absolutely necessary for checking the plague, and to show all possible consideration to the religious opinions and customs of the inhabitants. I can say nothing with regard to laying papers on the Table until I receive an official report on the subject from India.

Mr. WHITTAKER (on behalf of Mr. Herbert Roberts) asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the bitter complaints which had appeared in the vernacular newspapers of Poona and the Deccan generally with regard to the methods pursued by the authorities in dealing with the plague; whether he was aware that no such complaints had been made with respect to the administration in Bombay, and if it was the case that the work of dealing with the plague at Bombay had been surrounded with more difficulty than at Poona; whether he was able to lay papers upon the Table of the House with regard to the serious outrages reported from Poona; and whether he would order that a public and impartial enquiry should be held to investigate the administration with regard to the plague at Poona.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I am aware that, although the measures for checking the spread of the plague have been conducted on the same system at Poona and at Bombay, the unfavourable comments of the vernacular Press have been mainly confined to the newspapers of Poona and the Deccan. In view of the tone which had been previously adopted by those newspapers, this contrast does not afford matter for surprise. The recent outrages are now being enquired into by the police, and any publication of papers might tend to defeat the ends of justice. I have no reason to think, as at present advised, that any enquiry into the administration of Poona during the plague is necessary or desirable.

THE INDIAN FAMINE.

RECORD OF DEATHS FROM STARVATION.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to a statement in the *Pioneer* of March 14th last, that the Government of India had issued a circular to the officers whose duty it was to report the deaths from famine directing them not to report any deaths as due to starvation except in cases where it could be clearly established that the victims had no food for several days; and whether any means had been taken to prevent the trustworthiness of the record of famine mortality from being vitiated by this order.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware of the statements in a letter published in the *Pioneer* to which the hon. member

refers. I have seen no circular of the Government of India which would justify them, but I know that that Government have had reason to believe that deaths are frequently reported as due to starvation when they are really due to other causes, and that they have issued orders to prevent the famine statistics from being vitiated by inaccuracies of this kind.

July 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RUPEE LOANS AND STERLING LOANS.

Mr. THOMAS BAYLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had had brought to his notice the memorandum by Mr. J. H. Sleight, manager of the Bank of Bombay, showing the large economy that would be secured by taking up a sterling loan here instead of, as proposed by the Government officials, a rupee loan of four crores in India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: My attention has been drawn to the memorandum by the manager of the Bank of Bombay, showing what would in his opinion be the economy resulting from raising a loan in sterling instead of in rupees, as indicated in the financial statement of the Government of India. I will only point out to the hon. member that Mr. Sleight's calculations are purely hypothetical, being based on assumptions as to the price at which a second sterling loan could now be issued as compared with a rupee loan, and as to the rate of exchange, not only in the immediate future, but also during the whole of the next fifteen years.

THE OUTRAGES AT POONA.

Colonel LONG asked the Secretary of State for India what steps the Government were taking with regard to the state of feeling among natives in India as shown by late events, more particularly by the murder of Lieutenant Ayerst.

The hon. member also asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government proposed to recognise in any special manner the services rendered by Mr. Rand and those associated with him in the Poona plague operations.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I stated yesterday in this House that the causes and circumstances of the recent outrage at Poona are being investigated, and I have at present nothing to add to that statement. In reply to the hon. member's second question I can only say that all services rendered in connexion with the plague and famine will be duly considered, and will receive such recognition as they deserve.

Sir W. WENDERNBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in the plague administration European soldiers were employed in house visitations at Poona, whereas native sepoy were employed in Bombay, and whether he had any information to show that, in consequence, the feelings and prejudices of the people were more considered in Bombay than in Poona.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware that the services of British soldiers were utilized on plague duty at Poona. I cannot say for certain that they were not similarly employed at Bombay, but native soldiers were also employed. The European cantonment is large at Poona, while the number of European troops at Bombay is small. I have no information tending to show that the feelings and prejudices of the people were more considered in Bombay than in Poona. As I have already stated, I believe that in both places the Government have been most anxious to do nothing beyond that which was absolutely necessary for the purpose of dealing thoroughly with the plague in its early stages. Lord Sandhurst informed me some time back that he had met the leading inhabitants of Poona to discuss plague regulations, and that the result of the interview was satisfactory.

Sir W. WENDERNBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was his intention to propose Press legislation for India as the result of a private enquiry conducted by the Government regarding recent events at Poona.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have nothing to add to the answer I gave yesterday to the hon. member for Staffordshire, and if the hon. baronet will study the phraseology of that reply he will see that it will not bear the interpretation he has now endeavoured to place upon it.

Sir W. HARCOURT: Do I understand from the noble lord that no alteration will be made in the Press law of India until the House of Commons has had an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion upon that subject?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I do not know where the right hon. gentleman got that idea from; but I must respectfully point out to him that the Indian Government is responsible for the maintenance of law and order in India (Ministerial cheers), and that upon the Indian Government rests constitutionally the responsibility of initiating such measures as they may consider essential to the discharge of this their duty. (Ministerial cheers.) Any action which they may so take is, of course, subject to review in this House. There is no ground, in my judgment, at the present moment for reversing these well-established principles. (Ministerial cheers.)

July 5th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

DISTURBANCES IN INDIA AND THE SIMLA EXODUS.

Sir EDWARD GOSWELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the grave state of affairs in India, he would advise the immediate return of the Government from Simla to Calcutta:

And would he also make such arrangements for the future as would secure the presence of the employees at all seasons (save when on leave) in Calcutta, and thus obviate the necessity for the large annual expenditure involved in moving them to and from Simla.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no intention of offering advice on this subject to the Government of India, as I have complete confidence in their judgment as to the necessities of the situation. The question of the annual migration to and from Simla was carefully considered by one of my predecessors in office about nine years ago, and I see no reason for altering the arrangements which were then sanctioned.

DISTURBANCES AT CHITPUR.

Sir E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could give the House any information as to the recent disturbances at Chitpur, and especially as to the losses among the police.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have received the following telegram from the Government of India.

Telegram from Viceroy 4th July, 1897. "Riot in Calcutta due to possession being taken by Estate of Hindu, under orders of Court, of land alleged, it is said, falsely to contain Mosque. Monday, Police assisted in giving possession. Tuesday, 2,000 low class Muhammadans assembled to rebuild building, alleged to be Mosque, dispersed by police, and seventy arrests made on Wednesday morning. Mid-day Wednesday, rioters re-assembled and attacked municipal pumping station in the neighbourhood dispersed by police and military. Encounters between police and mobs in different places on Thursday, in which eight rioters reported killed and many wounded. Europeans attacked in places by rioters and some reported injured. No shots fired by military. Rioters quiet Friday and Saturday, and leading Muhammadans reported to be desirous of effecting compromise about land."

Telegram from Viceroy, 5th July, 1897. "Calcutta quiet Sunday." Mr. Stevens, the acting Lieutenant-Governor who was in Behar at the time of the outbreak returned to Calcutta yesterday evening.

The Government of India are of opinion that Mr. James, the new Commissioner of Police, acted "with promptitude and judgment. The Government consider the outbreak purely local, and the accounts of it are exaggerated. (Cheers.)"

THE OUTRAGES AT POONA— THE JOINT MEMORIAL.

"CATEGORICAL REPLY" FROM LORD SANDHURST.

Sir WILLIAM WENDERNBURN asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether he would provide facilities for the discussion of the present critical condition of affairs in Poona.

Sir L. McIVER: Before the right hon. gentleman answers

the question, may I ask him a question of which I have given him private notice? It is this—whether the Government have received any such information from Bombay as will enable the right hon. gentleman or the Secretary of State for India, to express an authoritative opinion upon the contents of the memorial relating to the measures adopted for the suppression of the plague which was mentioned by the hon. member for Banffshire last week in connection with the recent murders in Poona?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to answer the question which will take precedence of that upon the Paper. The House will recollect that on Thursday last the hon. member for Banffshire put to me a series of questions, in connexion with the Poona murders, upon the contents of a memorial addressed to the Bombay Government as to the methods adopted at Poona for the suppression of the plague. The memorial contained also allegations of gross misconduct against the search parties employed by the Government. The memorial was sent to me by the hon. baronet the day before he put the question, and it was unaccompanied by any statement supporting its allegations. I was unable then to express any opinion as to the credibility of its assertions, but I at once telegraphed to Lord Sandhurst asking him to send me a categorical reply to each series of accusations. In the meantime the memorial has been published, no doubt in good faith, by certain newspapers, and strong expressions of opinion have been given in the belief that these allegations and others even stronger by anonymous writers could not in the main be false. I have now a full reply from the Bombay Government which I will read to the House. (Cheers.) It is of considerable length, but in the circumstances the House will feel that I am justified. (Hear, hear.) The reply is divided into several heads, and therefore each will be prefaced by a statement of the allegations to which it refers: "From Governor, Bombay, July 4th, 1897. Deccan Sabha Memorial, dated May 10th, and petition were not received till May 21st, by which time the search, lime washing, and disinfecting parties had been discontinued and military camp broken up. Statements in petition grossly misleading." Allegation A: "People are often sent to the plague hospital without a proper medical examination being previously made to satisfy the authorities that the persons removed are suffering from plague." Reply: "People only sent to hospital after careful medical examination, and if showing symptoms indicative of possible plague." Allegation B: "Relatives and neighbours of plague patients, and even passers-by, are at once hurried to the segregation camp, without being allowed time to make proper arrangements for the custody of the property in their houses." Reply: "Greatest care was taken not to remove to segregation camp any but those necessary to keep under observation. Time was allowed for preparation, and one member of household was allowed to stay behind to look after property." Allegation C: "In the inspection of inmates of houses sometimes persons are subjected to the indignity of being forced to remove all the clothes from their bodies in the presence of the members of the search parties and other people." Reply: "I have not yet heard any allegations of indignity being substantiated. I know that gentleness and consideration were shown." (Cheers.) Allegation D: "The native gentlemen who volunteered to accompany search parties, and were appointed by the committee to that duty, are slighted, and their suggestions are disregarded. In support of this we beg that reference may be made to these gentlemen, who, feeling that they are not properly trusted, decline to accompany the search parties." Reply: "Native gentlemen were asked to accompany search parties, and did so to the very end. They were specially desired to bring to notice all complaints which reached them and to mark down any offending soldier and report to officers." Allegation E: "In the inspection of houses no respect is shown to the religious sentiments of natives in regard to the sanctity of the kitchen and of rooms where worship is offered. In some cases the idols in the Hindu temples have been polluted." Reply: "Search parties were instructed to have regard to religious feelings. Possibility of abuse of those feelings minimised by the presence of native gentlemen." Allegation F: "Notwithstanding the injunctions of the committee in that behalf, much mischief is done in regard of property in burning or destroying, though the rules of the committee require that only the bedding and the clothing of the deceased should be burnt." Reply: "Special care was taken to avoid needless destruction

of property, and compensation given for property destroyed." Allegation G: "Persons occupying houses are threatened, and in some cases assaulted, when they remonstrate against the procedure followed by the search parties in the matter of forcibly opening locks and destroying property." Reply: "No unnecessary violence was used in entering houses." Allegation H: "In a few cases the modesty of native ladies has not been respected." Reply: "I do not believe the possibility of indignity to native women, owing to presence of lady doctors and other ladies with the search parties." (Hear, hear.) Allegation I: "Complaints were made to the committee, but the persons injured have failed to obtain redress. The parties injured have no means of finding out the names of the soldiers who misbehave, and who thus bring discredit on the whole body." Reply: "Officers were in plentiful attendance, and it was made known that complaints should be made to them. See also D as to agency employed. English soldiers amounted to little more than one-third of total number, remainder being natives. English soldiers employed mainly for search parties, and their employment certainly not more calculated to cause annoyance than employment of natives, and experience showed for this work the necessity for European agency where procurable. In Poona the only European agency obtainable on a large scale was military." With respect to himself Lord Sandhurst says: "I went to Poona to see about ladies and native gentlemen accompanying search parties; called together leaders of communities and explained what must be done, and that all regard would be paid to religious and other feelings, and asked their aid. I visited Poona twice during operations for enquiry and discussion with Rand and others; never could I find serious complaints substantiated. I kept close touch, hearing from Rand daily. No specific charge of misconduct was made to me during progress of the operations. I give strongest and most emphatic contradiction to the statement that search parties exceeded instructions and grossly misconducted themselves. (Cheers.) The search parties whom at work were under commissioned and non-commissioned officers. One of the ladies, Miss Bernard, having twenty years' experience zenana work, and most sympathetic to natives, authorities me to say that she was much struck by the gentleness of the officers and the control of the soldiers, that the officers impressed on the men the delicate nature of the duties, that after the first day or two when there was some little apprehension, which was easily allayed by the ladies and native gentlemen accompanying the search parties, they were met with cheerfulness; that Rand listened to all complaints and suggestions, and was kind and courteous to all. In Rand the Civil Service loses a most able and devoted officer. From inquiries made from various sources I am convinced that Poona owes gratitude to officers and men. English and natives, for the duties so well and so considerately performed." (Cheers.) I would only wish to add an expression of my own opinion on two matters. I would wish to endorse the high opinion entertained by Lord Sandhurst of the late Mr. Rand and his work. (Hear, hear.) He was a most capable and promising public servant, who carried out with rare success the terrible trying duty of stamping out the plague in Poona. During the whole time he was thus engaged he was subject to the most violent personal denunciation and defamation by a certain section of the Press and community. He has fallen a victim from the successful discharge of a great public duty, and I am sure that under these circumstances, both members of this House and the Press of this country will exercise great caution before they put into circulation statements calculated to defame his character and work, unless they are personally convinced of the accuracy of any charge they publish. (Cheers.) This caution will, I am sure, be observed also in reference to the more grave charges that, without one iota of evidence, are being made about military officers and their men. As to Lord Sandhurst, he has from the first outbreak of plague personally supervised and controlled the measures of its suppression. Whenever any hitch occurred either at Poona or Bombay he has personally visited the locality, and by his consideration, tact, and forthright reassured and carried with him the natives whom he has met. He emphatically repudiates these charges, and I unhesitatingly endorse his repudiation. (Cheers.) Lord Sandhurst's conduct throughout the whole period of these plague difficulties has been such as to merit and obtain the complete confidence of Her Majesty's Government, and I think I may add of his late political colleagues and associates. (Cheers.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: After what has fallen from my noble friend, it is only necessary for me to say, in answer to the question on the paper, that, in the opinion of the Government, it is both unnecessary and contrary to the public interests that the discussion which the hon. baronet desires should take place. (Cheers.)

Mr. BRYN ROBERTS asked whether the memorial referred to did not contain specific statements in proof or attempted proof of the different heads of complaint, and whether the reply contained any explicit explanation or denial of those statements.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: In no single case has any serious charge of misconduct been substantiated.

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER asked whether it was true, as reported in certain newspapers, that negotiations had been entered into by the police authorities with the rioters.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON did not understand that there was any intention on the part of the Government that any compromise whatever should be come to between the police and the rioters.

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER asked whether he was to take it that the statement in the *Times* was in error.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: So far as I know, you may take it that it is so.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, under present circumstances, he would fix the debate on the Indian Budget for an early date.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that there is any reason for giving a different answer than that which I have already given the hon. gentleman in answer to the same question in the course of the present Session. I am, of course, anxious to consult the convenience of the House in regard to this matter, but I doubt whether it would be desirable to make any alteration in the ordinary date fixed.

July 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

IRRIGATION WORKS.

On the motion of Mr. SAMUEL SMITH a Return was granted showing (1) particulars of the protective irrigation works which cost the State during the last fifteen years Rs.1,813,841: and (2) particulars of the protective railways on the construction of which Rs.6,550,931 were expended during the same period, as stated in the fifth paragraph of the Financial Statement for 1897-8."

July 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIA AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On the motion of Mr. T. GIBSON BOWLES, a Return was granted showing the names of present members of the House of Commons who are in receipt of public money from the revenues of India, whether in the form of salary, pay, pension, or allowance of any kind, or who have received commutation in respect thereof, under the Commutation Acts; the amount they receive or have commuted, with the amount of the commutation money; and the name of the office or nature of the service for which the money is or has been paid (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 197, of Session 1897).

July 9th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

INDIAN CASES BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY asked her Majesty's Government if they would appoint a Mussulman and a Hindu lawyer to act as assessors in Indian cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and if they would confer knighthood on the High Court judges on their appointment, as was the

practice with judges of the Supreme Court of Calcutta. He said that when he brought before the House last year the complaints of both Hindus and Mussulmans with respect to decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Under Secretary for India had taken no notice of his statements, but had confined himself to a flat contradiction. The noble and learned lord on the Woolsack had also blamed him for impugning a decision of the Privy Council, and said that his course ought to have been to ask her Majesty's Government to alter the law as laid down by the Privy Council. But how was the alteration to be asked for unless a case was made out? and that could hardly be done without implying that the Privy Council decision was unsatisfactory. Under these circumstances he had written an article in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* of January last, advocating the appointment of a Hindu and a Mussulman lawyer to act as assessors in Indian cases—a course for which there were precedents in the Privy Council in ecclesiastical cases, and in the House of Lords in Admiralty cases. He had learned since this article was published that the India Office would reply that there were no persons in India fit to be assessors. Now Mr. Justice Amir Ali was perfectly fit to be an assessor for Mussulman cases, and whenever he has finished his time for being entitled to half his pension as a High Court judge he would be ready to come to this country. If he is fit to be a High Court judge, it cannot be said that he is not fit to be an assessor to the Judicial Committee. With regard to the Hindu assessor, Mr. Bhattacharya, the author of a commentary on Hindu law, is stated to be in other ways, such as knowledge of Sanskrit, perfectly fit to be a Hindu assessor. Other Hindu names had been given him, but as they do not equal Mr. Bhattacharya in merit, it is unnecessary to refer to them. My Hindu correspondent very properly observes that: "The difficulty of finding assessors for the Privy Council is, no doubt, great. But if the appointments were to be made, the difficulty would no longer be felt, for persons will qualify themselves. At the present time the number is extremely few. Another difficulty is the unknown conditions of the appointment. Persons may be fit but not willing to cross the seas or reside in England. The question of remuneration and the position to be assigned to assessors is another great factor. I take it that the assessor must be familiar with the English language, and must have mastery over the Hindu and Mussulman law in the original, not the English Acts, but Arabic and Sanskrit treatises on the subject." This opinion seems very reasonable, and what the writer says would dispose of the objection, even if well founded, of there being no person fit. I would suggest that if her Majesty's Government were willing to entertain the proposal favourably, that both the position and remuneration required would be provided for without any trouble by appointing two such assessors to be members of the Council of the Secretary of State for India. As the noble earl the Under-Secretary of State for India had not accepted his statements with regard to a Privy Council decision last year, perhaps he would be pleased to hear a resolution which had been passed in Bengal: "That the heartfelt thanks of this association be conveyed to Lord Stanley of Alderley for having, in the House of Lords, given expression to the views and feelings of the Mussulman community in India with regard to the recent decision of the Privy Council on the question of Wakf, which the Mussulmans consider as inconsistent with the provisions of their law and religion, and as tending to disturb many of their long-cherished social, charitable, and religious institutions, and to render insecure the existing titles to large properties throughout India." He would add that he had asked a legal gentleman to revise the article in the *Asiatic Quarterly*, so as to avoid, if possible, all expressions displeasing to the noble and learned lord on the Woolsack. Besides those points in Privy Council decisions, which he mentioned as being unsatisfactory, a competent person in the India Office had told him that the Privy Council judges could not understand what an impartible estate was. Perhaps there was more unwillingness than inability. To understand this it was not necessary to read Mr. Bhattacharya's book: a much more readable description and explanation of its origin is to be found in the *Cité Antique* of M. Faustri de Coulanges, who describes the primitive institutions of the Greeks and the Romans, and shows how they were identical with those of the Hindus, all these laws and institutions having been derived from principles common to those three nations. The Judicial Committee as regards Indian

cases requires strengthening by means of the English judges it receives from India, and the Indian Administration has for many years been endeavouring to diminish the dignity of the Judicature. Dr. Field, an ex-judge of the High Court of Calcutta, in an article named "Government and the Calcutta High Court," in the April number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, dates this policy from 36 years ago. He complains of the withholding the dignity of knighthood from the judges of the High Court presiding over the administration of justice to a population of over seventy millions; whilst the judges of the old Supreme Court were knighted, though the limits of its ordinary jurisdiction extended no further than the town of Calcutta. He points out that a knighthood conferred after some years of service, or upon retirement, suggests considerations inconsistent with a proper conception of judicial independence. Then the precedence of the Calcutta judges was taken away; Dr. Field asks "on what grounds that did not exist when the High Courts were first established, at which time such a change as part of the general scheme would have been wholly invidious." The next step in the policy of lowering the status of the High Court judges was to reduce their salaries. The position of a Calcutta judge, once worth more than £5,000 a year, is now worth little more than half that sum. The last step recently taken to diminish the worth of these appointments, and further lower the status of the Court, is to extend the period of actual service qualifying for full pension from 11½ to 13½ years. Dr. Field then quotes from an address presented last September to the retiring Chief Justice by representatives of the European and Indian communities:—"It is with regret that we have noticed that in India, where a proportion of the judges of the highest courts in the land are drawn from the Bar of England, the emoluments and conditions of service have been so altered as to make it increasingly difficult to obtain for the High Courts the services of men whom it is most desirable on all grounds should be attracted to them." The retiring Chief Justice, whilst agreeing with the views of the address, stated that a very large number of the more experienced of the district judges retired upon the promulgation of the new rules. The conditions of life in India are improved for the Civil Service by the hill stations, but the judges of the Calcutta Court do not share in these advantages, as they remain in the plains throughout the hot weather. Besides the complaints made by Dr. Field, it may be observed that for some time some Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal and other civil servants under them have treated the High Courts and the magistracy with less than fitting respect. Much satisfaction was, therefore, caused by a report that the late Government thought of sending their Lord Chancellor as Viceroy to India, and it was hoped that this would secure respect for the dignity of the judicial body.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said that although the noble lord's notion was in the form of one question it comprehended two different subjects. He only proposed to say something in respect of the first part of the question. The noble lord expressed a hope that he should have forgotten what he said last year. He was very glad to find that the noble lord had forgotten what he said—(laughter)—because his objection to the noble lord then was that he proceeded to discuss at considerable length, and with very scant courtesy towards the learned judges who had decided it, the question that had been decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. That night, he was bound to admit, the noble lord had entirely avoided any objection of that sort, and, but for his preamble, he should simply have said in reply to him that he was not able to advise her Majesty's Government to appoint the assessors whom he suggested, even if it were not a sufficient answer to say that they had no power to do it. He did not agree that there had been any real dissatisfaction with the decision to which the noble lord referred. Where there were two sides to a question he presumed the side against whom the decision had been recorded would be dissatisfied with it, and if they were to proceed to alter the law in every case where there would be any dissatisfaction at the decision arrived at there would be a constant oscillation between one law and another. Although there was a little technicality in it, perhaps their lordships would allow him to explain what the decision was. The case came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in which the validity of a certain settlement was in question. There was in the Muhammadan law, as there was in the English law, an objection against perpetuity—that was to say, the right of one person to stretch his arm at great length

beyond the grave and determine what should be the destination of property for a very long period. The particular settlement in question was one in which it was sought to get out of the provision against perpetuity in the Muhammadan law by having, at the end of it, a bequest in favour of the poor, because, again, the Muhammadan law, as the English law, recognised the existence of a charitable trust. The only question of debate was the validity of this particular instrument. The people who had devised this ingenious contrivance had made a settlement which was practically in perpetuity. It was for the family or friends—anybody who might claim relationship by affinity or consanguinity with the settler, and in the event of these all being exhausted, then, "for the benefit of the poor." The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that that was a mere colourable addition, that the true character of the instrument was to establish a perpetuity and that the addition that in the event of a failure of all these persons it should then be a charitable trust, was only a colourable evading of the effect of the law. The noble lord would observe, therefore, that the effect of the decision was simply that that particular instrument, that that particular contrivance, was invalid. That was a decision affirming the decision of the High Court of Calcutta, and that decision was based on the previous decision of the native courts in which the same conclusion had been arrived at. He need not point out that that was not a decision which affected to alter, or did alter, the Muhammadan law. He did not know whether the noble lord suggested that, because there was dissatisfaction with the decision, there should be persons appointed who should instruct the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Indian law. It appeared to him that that certainty assumed that they were unable to do what they had been doing now for many years to, he submitted, the great satisfaction of her Majesty's Indian subjects, and he had never heard, until the noble lord himself suggested it, that their decisions had been questioned upon any ground of their ignorance of the matter with which they were dealing. They were competent, he presumed, to construe the English language, and the documents from which its decisions were obtained, and upon the authority of which they rested, were English translations, and he need not say that it was the duty of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, a duty which he was quite certain they discharged, to acquaint themselves with what was the Muhammadan law, just as they acquainted themselves with decisions of other systems of law which it was their duty to administer. He thought it right to make this explanation, lest it should be supposed that the Judicial Committee had, in this particular case, gone out of their ordinary course. His general answer to the noble lord must be that he did not think that the Government were at all prepared to adopt a new system of administering justice in the Judicial Committee, there being, as he thought, no failure of justice in particular cases. The answer to the first part of the noble lord's question was simply in the negative.

The MARQUIS OF SALISBURY: As my noble and learned friend has divided the question into two, perhaps I had better reply to the end of it. But I shall not deal with it in any more satisfactory way, because the only thing I can say is that it is not according to precedent to draw into discussion the use which her Majesty may make of her prerogative of conferring honour, and I should be sorry to set a bad example in that respect.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

East India (Examinations for the Civil Service).—Copy presented—of Regulations for Examinations for the Civil Service of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

THE EARTHQUAKE IN ASSAM.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received any official information as to the extent of the destruction by the recent earthquake in Assam of the property of the Welsh Presbyterian Foreign Missionary Society, which had stations in the Khasia and Jaintia Hills and in Sylhet:

And, whether he had any information as to the position of

the missionaries of that society in their present calamitous circumstances.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: No, Sir, I have no information concerning the injury done to the property in question. All telegrams received by me regarding the results of the earthquake have been published; tidings by mail have not yet arrived from Assam. The Viceroy's telegram of June 22 said: "Reassuring news from Sylhet district, where damage and distress caused by earthquake are less than was supposed."

THE ENLISTMENT OF EURASIANS.

Captain PIRIE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the system of enlisting Eurasians (the descendants of Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen in India) into the British Army in India, as carried on in past years, might now, in view of the strongly expressed desire of this class of Her Majesty's subjects, receive more distinct encouragement from the Government.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The question has been more than once carefully considered by her Majesty's Government, who are not prepared to make any change in the regulations under which this class can enlist in the British Army.

THE RIOTS IN CHITPURA.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any information to show that 600 was a low estimate of the number of persons killed in the recent riots in the City of Calcutta.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: So far from 600 being a low estimate of the persons killed in the recent riots in the neighbourhood of Calcutta, the real number seems to be seven ascertained deaths. The following is the latest telegraphic information that I have received on the subject, dated July 8: "Your telegram of yesterday. Government of Bengal reports number of killed during riots seven":—(cries of "Oh!")—"estimated number wounded about 20, of whom four or five may have since died, the bodies being disposed of by their relatives. Calcutta reported quiet to-day, and Muhammadar leaders scrupulously exerting themselves to allay excitement. Mill hands quiet."

MR. S. SMITH asked the noble lord whether the *Times* correspondent had not put the number at 600, and whether other estimates did not put it as high as 1,600.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I do not know where the hon. gentleman gets his information from, but I have given him the figures from the authentic report.

STERLING AND RUPEE LOANS.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the memorandum written by Mr. J. H. Sleight, manager of the Bank of Bombay, showing the large economy which would be secured by taking up a sterling loan in this country, and whether, in view of the proposal of the Government of India to take up a rupee loan of four crores in India, he would consider the desirability of adopting the course suggested.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I will refer the hon. member to the reply which I gave on 2nd July to a precisely similar question.

THE PLAGUE AT POONA. ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES.

MR. WERN asked the Secretary of State for India, having regard to the reply given by Lord Sandhurst as to certain allegations relative to the methods adopted at Poona for the suppression of the plague, and more particularly as to the statement that in the case of the inspection of the inmates of houses there was no possibility of indignity to Native women, owing to the presence of lady doctors and other ladies with search parties, would he state the number of lady doctors at Poona and their names.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I am informed by the Bombay Government that the lady doctors engaged with search parties were Miss Bernard, M.D., Miss Crawley, L.R.C.P., Miss Dids, hospital assistant, Mrs. Goodall, a Parsee with some medical qualifications. Other ladies were Mrs. Taylor, Miss Kelly, Mrs. Fernandez, Mrs. Balubai Awte (Hindu), Mrs. Bhimabai

Awte (Hindu), Miss E. Bernard, Miss Tarikha (Hindu), Miss M'Intosh (the Hong Kong nurse), when not employed as a nurse.

SIR M. BROWNAGE said that, arising out of the question, he wished to ask the noble lord whether, besides lady doctors, many other ladies did not, together with independent gentlemen, at Bombay, Poona, and other plague centres, accompany those search parties which went to private houses to perform the work of inspection and other duties in connexion with relief measures.

LORD G. HAMILTON: Yes; I believe that such assistance was given, and I understand that the Government encouraged such assistance. (Hear, hear.)

MR. MACNEILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been directed to a letter of the late Mr. Rand, dated the 9th April, 1897, stating that women in Poona would not in the future be examined in the public streets for plague spots without the consent of the male members of their families:

And, whether, having regard to this statement in this letter, he still adhered to the declaration that no charge of indignity inflicted on females by the officials of the Indian Government at Poona had been substantiated.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The hon. gentleman in his question asserts that the late Mr. Rand stated in a letter dated April 9, 1897, that women in Poona were examined in public streets for plague spots. The late Mr. Rand made no such statement in his letter of the 9th of April. (Hear, hear.) What he said was that no inspection of any females should hereafter take place in the streets if they or their families objected. Upon this word "inspection" the hon. baronet the member for Banffshire chose to put the interpretation attached to the word "examination," that it meant stripping women in the public streets in order to detect plague spots, and currency to this interpretation has been given by the press. The following telegram from the Government of Bombay disposes of this legend:—"Street inspection mentioned in Rand's letter of April 9th last arose thus:—When searching was first instituted, women in many houses remained in dark rooms, where it was impossible to see whether they were ill, so householders were desired to cause their women to come into an open place, such as reasonably light rooms, or courtyard, or street, merely that it might be seen whether they looked ill. If there appeared reason for actual medical examination, it was conducted with every regard for decency, not in public, and in case of women never by any one but a woman, unless no objection was raised to examination by a commissioned medical officer. Allegations that women were stripped in street to detect plague symptoms is malevolent fabrication." (Cheers.) "The native gentlemen and lady doctors must have been cognizant of street inspection, as of all that went on." This being so, I adhere to the answer I previously gave to the effect that in the opinion of the Bombay Government no charge has been substantiated that indignity was offered by the search parties to native ladies. (Cheers.)

July 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Petition from Kanwar Harnam Singh, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

THE STATE OF JHALAWAR.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government had come to a final decision as to the subdivision and settlement of the State of Jhalawar; if so, whether he would state what the arrangement was:

And, whether he would lay on the Table of the House the Papers relating to the present condition of affairs in the State.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The general outline of the final decision regarding Jhalawar is as follows: The claim of the Kotah State under the treaties and engagements of 1838 to recover possession of its ancient territories then assigned to Jhalawar is held to have been established. The other portions of Jhalawar, consisting of Chan Mahla and the Shahabad

Pergunnah, will be re-granted by the British Government to a selected member of the Kotah branch of the Qualin Singhi's family. An exchange, however, of Jhabrapatan for Ahahabad will be effected under suitable conditions, in order to retain the town of that name as the capital of the new State of Jhalawar. The decision was announced in Darbar on June 5th, and when I receive a report of the proceedings of the Government of India, I shall be happy to lay further papers relating to Jhalawar on the Table of the House.

THE NOMINATION OF MR. TILAK.

Sir ELLIS ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Governor of Bombay had confirmed the nomination of Gungadhar Tilak, of Poona, editor of the *Mahratta* and *Kesari* journals of Poona, to the Legislative Council:

And whether he was aware that Gungadhar Tilak, besides publishing attacks upon the British authorities in his papers, had himself made speeches inciting to rebellion; if so, whether the Government of India proposed to take any action in that matter.

Mr. HOWELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that Gungadhar Tilak, whose election to the Legislative Council of Bombay was reported to be confirmed by Lord Sandhurst, was some years ago sentenced to a double term of imprisonment for being concerned in a conspiracy to defame a distinguished Native statesman, Ras Bahadur W. Burvé, minister of an important Native State:

And whether the acceptance of that election to the Legislative Council by Lord Sandhurst was concurred in by his two colleagues, who, together with Lord Sandhurst, constitute the Government of Bombay.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer together questions 39 and 55, which both relate to the same subject.

It is true* that the nomination of Gungadhar Tilak to the Legislative Council has been confirmed by the Governor of Bombay, in whom alone the right of confirming or rejecting is vested under the Rules. Gungadhar Tilak was nominated in 1895 to the same position, and he was again nominated in 1897.

It is also true that Gungadhar Tilak was some years ago sentenced to imprisonment; that he is the editor of two newspapers; and that he has recently made the speech alluded to; but the question whether the articles which have appeared in those newspapers are seditious, and whether that speech contained an incitement to rebellion, is a matter of law, as to which the Government of Bombay has not at present arrived at any final opinion.

Sir E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Does the noble lord propose to take any action in regard to this nomination?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I certainly think it would be premature to express an opinion at present.

Mr. MACNEIL asked by whom this gentleman was nominated.

Lord G. HAMILTON said he believed he was nominated by the Central Municipal Authority of Bombay.

July 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE NOMINATION OF MR. TILAK.

Sir ELLIS ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether the other two members of the Government of Bombay agreed with the Governor in his acceptance of the nomination of Gungadhar Tilak to the Legislative Council.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I stated yesterday in this House that the Governor alone is responsible for the acceptance or refusal of a nomination to the Legislative Council. Members of the Bombay Council do not share this responsibility, and I have therefore no information as to their opinions on the subject of this nomination.

Sir ELLIS ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked whether it was not the usual practice in the cases of appointments of this kind for the head of the Government to consult the other members of the Government.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I do not know what the practice

is: but as the responsibility rests with the Governor, I think it is undesirable to enlarge that responsibility.

PETITIONS FROM ZEMINDARS.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received petitions from the zemindars of Fingeshwar, Khariar, and Shahaspur-Lohara, all in the Central Provinces, complaining of certain encroachments made by the local authorities on their ancient rights and titles; if so, whether any decision had been arrived at and any reply been sent to the petitioners: and whether he would lay copies of each reply upon the Table of the House.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: No, Sir. No such petitions as are described in the question have reached me. When I receive them together with copies of the replies (if any) which have been sent to them, I will consider whether they can be laid upon the Table.

FAMINE AND RAILWAYS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the difficulties encountered in the famine relief of the large province of Chutia Nagpur, owing to the absence of railway communication over an area of 21,000 square miles, with a population of over four millions:

And, whether any and what steps were contemplated for opening up railway communication throughout the province both for facilitating famine relief and developing the mineral and agricultural resources of the district.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware that there was at one time some difficulty in connection with the supply of food to Palamow, but I have heard of no other cases of difficulty in connection with the famine administration of Chutia Nagpur. There is a line of railway now under construction in the province of Chutia Nagpur by the extension southward of the East Indian Railway system from Mogul Serai to Gya, and eventually to Palamow. Proposals are also under the consideration of the Government of India for the creation of branch lines northward into Chutia Nagpur in connection with the Bengal and Nagpur Railway Company's system, which already traverses a portion of the province.

July 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

CIVIL SERVANTS OVER SIXTY-FIVE.

On the motion of Mr. HANBURY a Return was granted for "Copy of Minute by the Secretary of State for India stating the circumstances under which certain members of his permanent establishment have been retained in the Service after they have attained the age of 65."

THE POONA OUTRAGES

PROFESSOR GOKHALE'S STATEMENT.

Sir J. FERGUSON asked the Secretary of State for India if he would make enquiries into the truth of the specific allegations reported to have been made by Professor Gokhale of the Fergusson College, Poona, in the *Manchester Guardian* of July 2 last, for the authority of which he vouched, that two women were violated by British soldiers employed upon the plague search parties, one of whom committed suicide afterwards.

Mr. PARKER SMITH asked whether Professor Gokhale was the gentleman who addressed a meeting of hon. members about a week ago on the subject of the plague regulations.

Lord G. HAMILTON: As soon as my attention was directed to this allegation I thought it necessary, from the gravity of the accusation made and the apparent authenticity with which it was surrounded, at once to telegraph to the Governor of Bombay asking him to make immediate enquiries as to the truth of the charge. His reply is as follows: "Regarding Gokhale's statement alleging violation of women, from all enquiries I have made I am convinced this is a still more gross and malevolent invention than that about stripping women." (Cheers.) In reply to the second question, I believe my hon. friend is correct, that this is the same individual who recently addressed members of this House in one of the committee rooms.

Sir J. FERGUSON: May I ask whether this professor is in receipt of salary from the Government?

Lord G. HAMILTON: No, sir; he is a professor of political economy in a college which obtains a grant from the Bombay Government.

Sir H. VINCENT: Who invited the professor? (A laugh.)

The question was not answered.

Mr. TOMLINSON: Is it a Government appointment?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I cannot answer that, but I think the college authorities appoint.

July 15th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

DELAY OF EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM.

East India (Accounts and Estimates, 1897-8).—Copy presented,—of Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SIR M. M. BHOWNAGREE AND THE OUTRAGES AT POONA.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGREE asked the Secretary of State for India if he was aware that in the last two years an annual celebration to stir up disaffection against England among the Natives of India had been set on foot under the designation of the Shivajee Accession ceremony:

Whether his attention had been drawn to the fact that on the 12th, 13th, and 14th of last month such celebration took place on a large scale in Poona, when one, Professor Paranjpe, delivered a discourse, the substance of which was, that in discontent lay the root of prosperity, and contentment killed prosperity; also, that on the same occasion a man named Jinsiwale stated that Shivajee's ruling passion was a terrible disgust at the humiliation of his country and religion by aliens, that was, the British; and added that he did not see why the saying of the revolutionists in France, that they were not murdering men but simply removing the thorns in their way, should not be made applicable to the Deccan, of which Poona was the capital:

Whether he was aware that Gungadhar Tilak, the editor of the *Mahatta* and *Kesari* newspapers, presided at the celebration and made a speech, in which he counselled the murder of Europeans, and that the malabechas, that was, the British, had no charter from God to rule India:

And, whether any steps had been taken by the local authorities to stop such systematic training of large numbers of people and students, and the incitement of them to such actions as led to the assassination of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst within a week of the last Shivajee celebration.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I am aware that an annual festival has recently been established in commemoration of Shivajee. I have seen a newspaper report of certain speeches made at the festival which took place last month, and it supports the description given in the second and third paragraphs of the question. The question as to the connexion between public incitements to violence and crime is occupying the attention both of the Government of India and of the Government of Bombay, but I am not prepared at present to make any further statement on the subject. (Hear, hear.)

THE OUTRAGES AT POONA. THE MEMORIAL OF MAY 10.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could now state what enquiry was made at the time into the detailed allegations of oppression contained in the Poona memorial of the 10th of May regarding plague administration, and what reply was given to the memorialists.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: In reply to an enquiry which I addressed to the Governor of Bombay, I am informed that on the receipt of this memorial Mr. Rand was desired to report upon the allegations which it contained, and that the reply of the Government was postponed until his report should be received. The report was, however, still incomplete at the time of his murder, and consequently no reply has yet been given.

I should point out that the memorial was not sent to the Governor until the special plague duties had ceased. There was no ground for considering the possibility of a change of system. I am further informed that all complaints made to Government officers during plague operations were enquired into, and any matters including general allegations were subject to Lord Sandhurst's own personal enquiry.

The following question in the name of Sir W. Wedderburn also appeared on the paper: To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether any European soldiers, employed on plague duty at Poona, worked in any out of the way places away from the cognizance of their officers.

The hon. baronet said that the question had been so altered by the clerks at the Table that he did not propose to put it.

THOUGHTFULNESS OF SIR M. M. BHOW- NAGGREE.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said he desired most respectfully to direct the attention of the Speaker to what he conceived to be an abuse of the notice paper of the House and of the privilege of asking questions. On July 13th notice was given that the following question would be asked to-day. It was a question affecting private character and making personal charges, and it had not been asked:—

“Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggee—To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that a native paper of Bombay, called the *Gujarati*, has in its issue of the 13th ult., in writing on the sanitary measures under consideration for the protection of the British Army, described the same in English as the Government traffic in women and in the vernacular as the Government brothel system; also that the same journal stated with reference to the statute of her Majesty which the people of Lahore had decided to erect in commemoration of the Diamond Jubilee, that the high State officers had carried this proposal with the help of guns and bayonets; and whether the authorities in India had taken any, and if so, what steps to bring this journal to trial and to stop the continual efforts made by it to incite the native population against British rule.”

The rule, as he understood it, was distinct that when a personal accusation was embodied in a question on the notice paper, and got an extensive circulation through that agency, that question ought not to be withdrawn, but the hon. gentlemen who put it on the paper should have the courage to ask it. (Hear, hear.)

The SPEAKER: I do not see that the question of the hon. gentleman raises any question of order or privilege. The question which the hon. member has just read is not one which casts any reflection on the personal character of any individual. It is an attack on the policy of the Indian Government by an Indian newspaper, and the hon. member who put the question down was equally entitled to take it off. If the hon. member, however, desires to have the question answered, of course he is at liberty to put it down himself on the notice paper. (Laughter.)

Sir M. BHOWNAGREE as a matter of personal explanation, said that as the hon. gentleman opposite had charged him, impliedly if not explicitly, with not having the courage to put the question which appeared on the notice paper he wished to state why he did not do so. It would be seen that the question which he put ended with almost the same enquiry as that he did not put, and therefore he did not think it necessary to occupy the time of the Secretary of State for India or the House by putting the second question, the withdrawal of which the hon. gentleman, without any adequate justification, had objected to. That was the reason, and the only reason, why he withdrew the question.

July 16th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS.

East India (Contagious Diseases) (No. 6, 1897).—Copy presented,—of Further Correspondence regarding the Measures to be adopted for checking the spread of Venereal Disease among the British Troops in India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

July 19th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MORAL AND MATERIAL PROGRESS.

East India (Progress and Condition).—Copy presented,—of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1895-6. Thirty-second Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ELAVAS IN TRAVANCORE.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India, whether a class known as the Elavas were excluded from all appointments in the State of Travancore on the ground that they belonged to a low caste, although they formed over 16 per cent. of the population of the State, and contributed largely to its revenues:

Whether they were denied admission to most of the Government schools in the State, and whether two graduates of the Madras University (of this class) had recently been compelled to take service under the Madras and Mysore Governments because they were denied positions in their own State:

And, whether any, and, if so, what steps had been taken by the Madras Government, through the Political Agent, to remedy this state of things in Travancore.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no precise information as to the first question. As to the second I find from the latest report I have received that 9,517 Elava boys and 1,368 Elava girls were under instruction in Travancore, representing 8 per cent. of the total number of pupils. I have no information as to the two graduates referred to, and I must observe that in the internal administration of education and patronage in the Native States of India the British Government does not actively interfere. I have no objection, however, to calling the attention of the Madras Government to the question asked by the hon. member.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

During discussion as to the business of the House, the following question was asked.

Sir J. LUBBOCK: Can the right hon. gentleman (the First Lord of the Treasury) say when the Indian Budget will be taken?

Mr. BALFOUR: I shall carefully follow precedent in this matter. (Laughter.) I think there is no chance of our being able to take it until we reach the last week of the Session.

NOMINATIONS TO THE BOMBAY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Sir JAMES FERGUSON asked the Secretary of State for India what were the bodies to whom the privilege of election for the Governor's selection to the Legislative Council of Bombay had been granted:

And whether any, and what, changes had been made since the seats were originally allocated.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The eight bodies who enjoy the privilege of nominating members of the Bombay Legislative Council, subject to the Governor's approval, are at present as follows:—1. Bombay Corporation; 2. Bombay University;

3. Deccan Sardars; 4. Sind Landholders; 5. Municipalities of the Northern Division; 6. Local Boards in the Southern Division; 7. Bombay Chamber of Commerce; 8. Local Boards in the Central Division. The only material change that has been made since the seats were first allocated is that the Local Boards in the Central Division, of which Poona is the chief, have been substituted, as a nominating body, for the Karachi Chamber of Commerce.

July 22nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FISH-CURING IN BENGAL.

Mr. WARR asked the Secretary of State for India whether in the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay salt used for curing purposes was supplied from the Government Salt Works at cost price and free of duty, whereas in the Presidency of Bengal the full duty of two rupees eight annas per maund (equivalent to nearly £5 per ton) was imposed; and, if so, whether he would undertake to consider the removal of this inequality between the Presidencies, with a view to the encouragement of fish-curing in the Presidency of Bengal and consequent increase of food supplies.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Salt is supplied to persons working at fish-curing yards in Bombay and Madras at a price of eight to ten annas per maund duty free. Similar fish-curing yards have not been opened on the Bengal coast; but if there was likely to be a demand for such facilities, the Government would gladly encourage a fish-curing industry by granting the same privileges as in Madras and Bombay. The salt preventive staff is now being strengthened on the Bengal coast, and the management of fish-curing yards there will become easier.

July 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH RESIDENTS AT INDIAN COURTS.

On the motion of Major JAMESON, a Return was granted showing the salaries paid to the British Residents accredited to the Courts of Indian Rājās and to Heads of Departments (when employed), stating in each case whether they perform executive duties.

THE SHORT SERVICE SYSTEM.

Captain PRIEST asked the Under Secretary of State for War, whether the War Office would be prepared to reconsider the question of long service in India for British troops, as being both physically and financially advantageous, especially in view of the disastrous casualties from enteric fever and venereal disease among British soldiers in India.

Mr. BROMBICK: The application of the short service system to India has been proved to possess many advantages from a physical, financial, and military point of view, and her Majesty's Government has no intention of reverting to the old system of long service for the Indian army.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.]

VOL. VIII.

Parliamentary Report No. 8. SEPTEMBER, 1897.

This Supplement consists of a FULL Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from July 23 to August 6.

Imperial Parliament.

July 23.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIA AND THE ARMY.

In Committee of Supply on the Army Estimates, General RUSSELL rose to call attention to the great national danger resulting from the inadequacy of our military forces to supply the wants and requirements of the Empire, and also to the poor return which the British taxpayer received for the £19,000,000 which he paid for military armament.

In the course of the debate Sir H. HAVELOCK-ALLAN said the short service system must be credited with having had one great result—it had given us an efficient army in India and the Colonies. There was no question that the 73,000 men in India and the 26,000 men in the Colonies were as efficient as any troops in the world. In addition the present system had given us a reserve of 78,000 men. It was true that for economical reasons the reserve was never called up, but he believed that whenever they were they would soon recover all their old soldierly habits and efficiency. He maintained, however, that the present home army was inefficient. What that army was required to do was to garrison India and the Colonies, to garrison England against invasion, and to supply those expeditionary forces required from time to time. . . . Another defect arose in connexion with the rule in regard to India—that no man was to be sent to India unless he had attained the age of 20. He knew one regiment of 700 men, 300 of whom were over 20 years of age. That battalion had to supply 260 men for the battalion abroad, so that it was left only 50 men who were over 20 years of age and had one year's service. The consequence was that while the men abroad were good men, fit for soldiers, the battalions at home were reduced more or less to a mere school of boys. The remedy was that there should be established for every battalion in the first army corps a dépôt of 400 men which could feed the battalions abroad.

Mr. BRIDGES, in the course of his speech, said he must remind the Committee of what an enormous advance the army had made since the abolition of long service. There was always in the House a certain amount of opinion in favour of returning to the long service system. But it was forgotten that under long service great difficulty was found between Great Britain and India in keeping up the army of 160,000 men. When the men came home from India, there was very often not one man for three to send back from the dépôt, and not a single man in the reserve to call up in case of war. Now we had something like 207,000 with the colours in Great Britain and India. If from that number were deducted all

those soldiers in the first year of service, there remained, together with reserve, from which 10 per cent. at the outside might be deducted for those who did not respond to the call, a body of 254,000 men on whom the War Office could lay their hands to-morrow. No doubt this force was maintained at a cost-rate compared with that of foreign countries; but if it were replaced by men on long-service engagements, with the pensions which would be necessary, the cost would be £7,000,000 more than the present estimates. What we had at this moment was, perhaps, the most wonderful development of the voluntary system ever known in the world. Again, as to the position of the Indian army. In old days there was great difficulty in sending 5,000 or 6,000 men a year to India and of these men 2,000 generally were under 20 years of age. Last year over 9,000 men were sent to India, and of those not a single man was under 20, or of less than one year's service. These facts ought to be taken into consideration by those who only saw the worst of the short service system.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that, in bringing the Committee back to the larger question which was under discussion earlier in the evening, he must remind the Committee of one thing—that in dealing with the army they were dealing with an instrument, and not with a thing which was an object in itself. Our military establishments depended on our policy, and the question was, What was our policy? When the present system of linked battalions was adopted, it was founded on a calculation of the number of battalions required at home and abroad. Decade after decade we had gone on the supposition that the disproportion of those battalions was a passing incident which would ultimately disappear. But it was necessary to face the fact that there had been a great development of the public policy of the country. (Cheers.) The effect was that 30,000 men had been added to the army in the last twenty years. In India we had abandoned the old Lawrentian policy, and had the inestimable advantage of a scientific frontier, a concomitant circumstance of which was that we had now to maintain a much larger army in India than ever before. Then we had adopted the practice of occupying the remote valleys of the mountains on the frontier, which was a constant drain on our resources.

July 26.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY AND ITS RESULTS. THE TOCHI VALLEY PUNITIVE FORCE.

Mr. ROBERT WALLACE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Tochi punitive expeditionary forces had orders to distinguish the innocent from the guilty while inflicting punishment for the offence committed against this country:

Whether Malzar and Sheranni had been demolished, and the

stores and goods found in them appropriated by the punitive forces :

Whether any limit had been placed on the number of towns and villages, which it was necessary to destroy and empty of their contents, for punitive purposes :

Whether any compensation for their losses would be made to innocent survivors when the punitive expedition had successfully completed its labours :

And whether non-military newspaper correspondents were allowed to accompany the punitive expedition.

Lord G. HAMILTON : Undoubtedly the punishment to be inflicted by the Tochi field force will be confined to those who either took an active part in the recent treacherous outrage, or were assenting parties to it. I have no information as to the demolition of Maizar and Sherauni; but the amount of destruction must depend on the attitude of the guilty tribes. If they submit, I hope that few or no villages may be destroyed. If any injury is shown to have been unjustly or inadvertently inflicted the question of compensation will no doubt be considered; but in every case the tribe as a whole must be regarded as responsible for the acts of its members. As to the newspaper correspondents, I have no information.

REPORTED OUTRAGES ON NATIVE WOMEN.

Major RASON asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a paragraph in the *Daily News* of Thursday last embodying a statement from the Secretary of the Indian Association to the following effect: "Two gross cases are reported of attempted outrage on Hindu girls in the Khana plague inspection camp by two European officers, who have been suspended by the Government. Pandita Ramabai writes to a newspaper of the seduction of one of her girls in the Poona plague camp, utterly demoralising the arrangements there. These cases have created a great sensation all over the country"; and whether there was any truth in either allegation.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON : The allegations alluded to consisted of two charges, one in connexion with a segregation camp at Khana, in Bengal, for the detention of railway passengers, and the other in connexion with the late plague camp in Poona. I have received the following reports upon them: "Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal reports that police-sergeant and military assistant-surgeon were charged with making immoral overtures to two Hindu circus girls and a Japanese prostitute in segregation huts at Khana plague inspection camp. Japanese consented, and left with police-officer; circus girls declined, and, on assistant-surgeon pressing, one of them raised alarm. Police officer dismissed; assistant-surgeon suspended. His case being further investigated. Both are of European parentage; police-sergeant born and domiciled in India." As regards the second case, the Governor of Bombay telegraphs: "Pandita Ramabai's assertions had attracted my notice, and I enquired into them early in June. The girl she mentions was not seduced in the plague camp. She was a plague patient, and was discharged cured. What became of her afterwards is not known. The assertion about utterly demoralising the arrangements in Poona camp absolutely untrue. From first to last somewhere about 500 females were admitted; nearly all had relatives or friends attending them; no complaints of violated modesty were ever made. Officer in charge saw Pandita Ramabai herself on several occasions in the hospital, but she never made any complaint to him."

July 27.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. INDIAN GUARANTEED RAILWAYS.

Sir C. CAYZER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that the East Indian Railway Company, whose railway was built by British capital, under Government guarantee, and of which the Government were now the owners by purchase, had recently purchased 7,708 tons of steel rails and fish plates from the Maryland Steel Company, of America, and that the same was being shipped from America to Calcutta, the tender of the Maryland Steel Company, of America, being nearly 21 per ton lower than any British tender :

And whether some of the other Indian guaranteed railways

made it a condition of these tenders that the goods should be of British manufacture; and, if so, why the East Indian Railway Company, a Government-owned railway, could not also do so.

Lord G. HAMILTON : It has been the practice of the India Office to give the preference to British manufacturers, provided the difference in price and quality is not great. In this case I am informed that the tender accepted by the Board of the East India Railway Company appeared to be in all respects a satisfactory one as regards quality, and that by accepting in its place the lowest tenders of a British firm they would have incurred an additional charge of \$8,875.

Sir C. CAYZER asked the noble lord whether, if he could not give the House the information asked for in respect to each of the tenders received, he would give the particulars to the Commercial Intelligence Committee of the Board of Trade, in order that the best means might be ascertained of assisting British trade in its competition with foreign trade.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON : I may say that the tender of the Maryland Steel Company was £34,000, whilst the lowest British tender was £42,500, and I am informed that the quality of the rails was equal.

Mr. J. C. FLYNN asked whether it was customary to read to the House the figures relating to contracts entered into by public departments.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT asked whether the foreign tenderers undertook to conform to Trade Union regulations and to the provisions of the Factory Acts.

Mr. SPEAKER : Order, order. Notice should be given of that question.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said that he believed that it was not customary to give the figures of the different tenders, but that was not the question in this case. He was asked regarding the lowest British tender and the tender of the American firm.

July 29.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REPORTED MISCONDUCT OF A DISTRICT MAGISTRATE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the proceedings of Mr. Meredith, District Magistrate of Lahore, who entered the court of the local First Class Magistrate during the trial of a criminal case, rebuked him on account of an order he had passed in the case, and requested him to revise it :

And whether the course of action adopted by Mr. Meredith had been taken into consideration.

Lord G. HAMILTON : I have no knowledge of this matter, except from a newspaper report with which the honourable baronet has favoured me. The case as there stated, assuming the statement to be correct, is one in which, as at present advised, I see no necessity for interfering, and which may be safely left to be dealt with by the Local Government.

THE CASE OF MR. C. KUNHI KANNAN.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received a memorial, dated March 22 last, from C. Kunhi Kannan, late Deputy-Collector of Malabar, who was convicted of bribery and served a term of imprisonment :

Whether he was aware that since petitioner's conviction important fresh evidence had been discovered, and that Mr. Moberly, District Magistrate of Malabar, had recommended that he should be given an opportunity of showing that he was convicted on evidence which was either false or so tainted as to be unworthy of belief :

And whether he would cause enquiry to be made, and if the petitioner established his innocence, would grant him a free pardon in order to vindicate his character.

Lord G. HAMILTON : The memorial in question has not yet been officially forwarded from India, but a copy which was sent to me direct reached me on the 14th of last month. I will ask the Government of India how it proposes to deal with the matter.

PAPER CURRENCY AND SILVER COINAGE.

Sir SAMUEL MONTAGU asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the great increase in late years of the fiduciary issue of notes by the Indian Government, and to the large contraction of the paper currency, as shown by the fact that in 1893, when the mints were closed, there were: Rx. 26,401,820 total notes in circulation, Rx. 18,401,820 coin and bullion held, Rx. 8,000,000 Government securities, whereas there were, on May 31, 1897: Rx. 22,861,621 total notes in circulation, Rx. 12,861,626 coin and bullion held, Rx. 99,999,994 Government securities:

Whether the Indian Government intended to coin on their own account silver rupees sufficient to place their paper currency on a sounder basis:

And whether they would in future publish their accounts as regards currency weekly instead of monthly, so as to enable prudent bankers and merchants to provide in time against the possible danger of an extreme scarcity of currency in India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The figures given in the hon. member's question are correct. I am not aware of any intention on the part of the Government of India to coin silver on their own account. As to the publication of accounts, which now takes place monthly in accordance with the provisions of Act No. 20 of 1882, I will communicate with the Government of India, but I can give no promise that the hon. member's suggestion will be adopted.

THE REPEAL OF THE VERNACULAR PRESS ACT.

Sir M. BHOWNAGGER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that Lord Hartington, as Secretary of State for India in 1881, in Mr. Gladstone's Government, forwarded a despatch to the Government of India suggesting that the existing defect in the Indian Penal Code, viz., the explanation to section 124a, which made it ineffective against seditious and libellous writings, should be remedied; whether this recommendation of Mr. Gladstone's Government to strengthen the law of seditious libel was ever acted upon; and, if it was not, whether her Majesty's Government, having regard to the grave results which had followed upon the seditious writings in the vernacular press, would recommend the Government of India to introduce legislation without further delay in the manner suggested in Lord Hartington's despatch.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware that it was suggested by the Secretary of State in Council in 1881 that, if it were the case that the Criminal Law of India applicable to seditious libel was practically unworkable through the effect of the explanation attached to section 124a, the existing defect in the code might be remedied by the suitable amendment of some of its provisions. For various reasons, such amendment has been from time to time postponed; but, as I have already stated, the question of legislation on this subject is now being considered afresh.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY AND ITS RESULTS.

Sir E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could give any information as to the attack upon British forces at Malakand.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The first intimation received was from Major Deane on July 26. He reported the advance of a local gathering in the Swat Valley excited by the preaching of a mad Fakir. Their attack upon the Malakand Kotal was repulsed after severe fighting. Chakdara was also attacked and communication with it interrupted. A later report showed that another attack on the camp was expected, and shortly afterwards, on the night of the 27th, telegraphic communication with Malakand was interrupted. Certain movements of troops in relief of the Malakand garrison were at once ordered. Last night telegraphic communication was restored, and information was received that the British troops were engaged throughout the 27th, and a general attack was made upon them between 8.30 p.m. and daybreak of yesterday. Desultory fighting continued all yesterday, but the assailants were repulsed everywhere, the British loss amounting apparently to Lieutenant Costello of the 22nd Bengal Infantry wounded, 11 Sepoys killed and 42 wounded. Further attacks are expected, and the reinforcements are being pushed forward with speed.

July 30.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY AND ITS RESULTS.

Lord REAY said he wished to ask her Majesty's Government whether any further information could be given with regard to the operations in the Swat Valley, which had already resulted in the unfortunate loss of many brave men. Since putting the question on the Paper he had seen that the Secretary of State for India yesterday, in another place, mentioned that the cause of the rising of the tribes was the preaching of "Mad Mullah," but if there were any other causes he hoped they might be communicated to the House. The last part of his question referred to the area over which the rising, which seemed to be on a considerable scale, was spread.

The Earl of SALISBURY: In the unavoidable absence of my noble friend the Under Secretary of State for India, I have been asked to give the noble lord the information that he asks for. The telegrams published in the London press give information regarding the military operations in the Malakand and in Swat, which agree with the shorter reports received at the India Office. It would be impossible for her Majesty's Government to make any statement of the causes which have led to the attack without enquires, which cannot be conducted whilst the fighting continues, and further information must be awaited before the area of the disturbance can be fixed. Dargai, situated somewhat to the south of Malakand Pass, has not been attacked. It may be of interest to your lordships if I read out two telegrams received from India yesterday and to-day. "From Viceroy, July 29, 1897. Malakand—Camp attacked again last night. Casualties: Lieutenant Ford, 31st Bengal Infantry, wounded severely; Lieutenants Maclean, Guides, Swinley, 31st Bengal Infantry, slightly wounded; 2 Sepoys killed, 8 wounded. Enemy's loss not known? They charged up to breastworks, but could not penetrate. Pursuit was not attempted, owing to fatigue of men. Chakdara safe. Dargai has not been attacked. Officers wounded doing well, except Colonel Lamb and Lieutenant Ford, whose condition is serious. In fighting of yesterday, when 24th Bengal Infantry were pressed on flank by enemy, counter attack, led by Lieutenant Climo, drove back large body of enemy with loss of 90. 38th Bengal Infantry and squadron of 11th Bengal Lancers, strength 8 European officers, 12 native officers, 652 rank and file, will probably reach Malakand this evening; 35th Bengal Infantry following. 37th Bengal Infantry ordered Peshawar, 8th Bengal Infantry Nowshera, to replace troops reinforcing Malakand. Regret to say Major Taylor, 45th Bengal Infantry, dead." "From Viceroy, July 30, 1897. Malakand—Total casualties up to July 29, apparently:—Killed: European officers and non-commissioned officers, 3; native ranks, 17; followers, 15. Wounded: European officers, 9; native ranks, 71; followers, 11.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE RECENT EARTHQUAKE.

Mr. HERBERT ROKETS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any further information as to the destruction by the recent earthquake of the property of the Welsh Presbyterian Foreign Mission Society in the Khasia and Jaintia Hills and in Sylhet.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I regret to say that very serious damage has been done in Sylhet; but as regards the particular property mentioned in the question I have as yet received no information.

THE POONA PROSECUTIONS.

Mr. MACNEILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the charge of sedition on which proceedings, including arrest and refusal of bail, had been instituted by the Indian Government against Gangadhar Tilak was founded on an article so far back as June 15:

And why the prosecution had been deferred till a period when, owing to the prorogation of Parliament, the conduct of those proceedings would be exempted from immediate Parliamentary criticism.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no information from the Government of India or from that of Bombay as to the date or dates of the article or articles on which this prosecution has been instituted. On questions of this kind the Governments in India must have a free hand, and I do not propose to interfere with them in the exercise of their discretion.

Mr. MACNEILL said what he wished to know from the noble lord was whether the Government of India were responsible to the House of Commons or not.

The SPEAKER: Order, order. That is not a question to be answered.

Mr. MACNEILL: Yes, Sir, I know the answer. (Laughter.)

INDIAN COLLIERIES.

Mr. SORWAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Umaria Colliery, belonging to the Government, had been worked, and the price of coal fixed at so low a rate as to produce, in the year 1896, a profit of only 0.13 per cent. on the capital, and in the year 1896 a loss of Rs. 1,436:

Whether his attention had been drawn to the statement in the published reports (Administration Report, Railways) that the capital outlay on December 31, 1895, was Rs. 1,078,883; that Rs. 88,911 was expended on capital account during 1896, making the total capital outlay on December 31, 1896, Rs. 1,167,774; and that the receipts during the year 1896 were Rs. 379,429, and the expenditure Rs. 380,866, showing a loss of Rs. 1,436:

And whether there were other colliery companies paying royalties to the Government which were deprived of any dividend by their price for coal being forced down by reason of the bounty system adopted by the Indian Government.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The figures given in Clauses 1 and 2 of the honourable member's question appear to be correctly cited from the Reports presented to Parliament, with this difference, that the figures for capital expenditure, yearly receipts and expenditure, profit and loss, are stated at ten times the actual amounts, as given in the Reports. I am not aware of any Indian collieries that pay royalty to Government, except those in Assam and Burma, and I do not think the coal of those companies has ever reached, or is likely to reach, the Central India railways, which now consume 70 per cent. of the total output of Umaria coal.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY AND ITS RESULTS.

Sir E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any information to give the House as to the fighting at Malakand.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received the following telegram: "From Viceroy, July 29, 1897. Camp attacked again last night. Casualties—Lieutenant Ford, 31st Bengal Infantry, severely wounded; Lieutenants Maclean, Guides, Swinley, 31st Bengal Infantry, slightly wounded; two Sepoys killed, eight wounded. Enemy's loss not known. They charged up to breastworks, but could not penetrate. Pursuit was not attempted, owing to fatigue of men. Chakdara safe. Dargai has not been attacked. Officers wounded doing well, except Colonel Lamb and Lieutenant Ford, whose condition is serious." They go on to say that reinforcements would probably reach Malakand yesterday evening; and this evening I received the following telegram: "From Viceroy, July 30, 1897—Malakand. Total casualties up to July 29, apparently: Killed, European officers and non-commissioned officers, three; native ranks, 17; followers, 16. Wounded: European officers, nine; native ranks, 71; followers, 11."

July 31.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir W. WENDREBURN, addressing the Speaker, said:—Sir, With the permission of the House I desire to make a personal explanation, because by to-day's Indian telegrams I see that Professor Gokhale acknowledges without reservation that he was misled by his correspondents, and that he withdraws the charge against British soldiers engaged in plague operations at Poona. (Hear, hear.) As I was the means of introducing Professor Gokhale, with other Indian witnesses, to members of this House in the conference room, and thus afforded him an

opportunity of making these statements, I desire unreservedly to express my deep regret that, directly or indirectly, I should have aided in giving currency to a charge which proves to have been unfounded. (Cheers.)

Sir J. FERGUSON: If I am in order, I should like to ask the hon. member whether it is also the case that Professor Gokhale attributes some statements—

The SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. member is not in order in raising a discussion upon a personal explanation.

August 2.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE POONA ARRESTS.

Mr. DAVITT asked the Secretary of State for India, could he state how many arrests of British subjects had been made in India recently under the Law of *lettre de cachet*:

Whether the persons thus arrested were to be imprisoned indefinitely without trial:

Whether this system of punishment for alleged political offences was a proceeding sanctioned by any canon of English law; and, if so, would he state what such law was:

And whether any British subject, so arrested and imprisoned in India, had the right of trial before any court of India, or any right of appeal to any tribunal in England.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The first question refers to the Bombay regulation of the Act 25 of 1827. There are two arrests under it. As to the second question, I cannot say what may be the intentions now or hereafter of the Indian Government. As to question three, it seems to me to be a matter of opinion, and the hon. member can consult the regulation and form his own opinion. As to question four, there is no appeal.

Mr. MACNEILL: Under regulation 25 can they be arrested and kept in prison indefinitely without trial?

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Indian Government have powers to detain as long as they think necessary.

Mr. DAVITT: May I ask the noble lord whether his sanction was obtained for these arrests before they were made?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Yes.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY AND ITS RESULTS.

Mr. WEIR asked the Under Secretary of State for War if he would state what rifles were used by the British troops in the fighting at Malakand:

And had the troops any Maxim guns; and, if so, could he state whether they were water-jacketed, and fitted with the new automatic supply system.

Lord G. HAMILTON: No British troops were engaged at Malakand. The native troops have Martini-Henry rifles.

There are two Maxim guns which are water-jacketed. I have no knowledge of the automatic supply system.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY AND ITS RESULTS.

Colonel Lookwood asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any news to communicate to the House as to the garrison at Chakdara.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have two telegrams. The first, from the Viceroy at Simla received at the India Office, August 2, 11.47 a.m., is as follows:—

"Malakand.—In continuation of my telegram in the Military Department, dated yesterday. Cavalry reconnaissance with flanking infantry support met with strong opposition, and was obliged to retire. Casualties—Captain G. M. Baldwin, the Corps of Guides, wounded severely; Lieutenant C. V. Keyes, the Corps of Guides, wounded slightly. Native ranks—the Corps of Guides, 11th Bengal Lancers, 12 wounded, three dangerously. Enemy following up attacked north side of camp. General Blood having arrived and assumed command, wires this morning columns under Meiklejohn and Goldney advanced at dawn and attacked enemy on made road and on hills. Attacks brilliantly executed, and, so far as could be seen from Malakand, completely successful. Officers previously wounded doing well, except Lamb and Costello, doing fairly." (Cheers.)

I have a further telegram in these terms: "Chakdara relieved; garrison safe." (Cheers.)

August 5.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE NEW CANTONMENT REGULATIONS.

On the motion of Mr. JAMES STUART, a Return was granted of Memorials addressed to the Secretary of State for India by the British Committee of the Federation for the Abolition of State Regulation of Vice against the new Cantonment Regulations proposed by the Government of India, and by the British Women's Temperance Association against any intervention of the State for the regulation of immorality.

EXCISE REVENUE IN BENGAL.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India whether there were grounds for the belief that there was a tendency to increase the number of outstills in Bengal where they already existed, and whether the introduction of the outstill system in some districts where it did not now exist was also in the contemplation of the Government;

Whether in 18 districts where the outstill system was already in force the annual average number of stills for the five-year period, 1890 to 1895, was 1,286, while the number licensed in 1896 was 1,456, showing an increase of nearly 200;

And, whether the Excise Revenues of Bengal had increased nearly 1,000 per cent. in 60 years.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not aware of any grounds for the belief that there is a tendency to extend the outstill system in Bengal; the information in my possession points rather in the other direction.

As regards the second part of the hon. member's question, I believe that there are thirty districts in which the outstill system is wholly or partially in force. The annual average of licensed outstill liquor shops in Bengal was 3,441 for the five years 1885-90, and 1,949 for the five years 1890-95.

No fair comparison can be made between the excise revenues of Bengal sixty years ago and those of the present day; but it is certain that on every exciseable article a larger revenue is now paid, and that evasion of duty is much more difficult than in 1837.

THE POONA OUTRAGES.

Mr. HAZELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether, having regard to the special circumstances of the case, it would be possible to make an extra allowance to the widow of Lieutenant Ayerst, who was murdered at Poona on June 22 last.

Lord G. HAMILTON: In cases of this kind it is usual to leave the initiative to the Government of India. Any recommendation which they may make in favour of the widows of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst will receive the careful consideration of the Secretary of State in Council.

THE EXTINCTION OF JHALAWAR.

Mr. PICKERSGILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether Papers would be presented to Parliament relating to the recent partition of the Jhalawar State, and the annexation of the larger portion of it to the State of Kotah; and whether he would include in those Papers copies of the Despatches of the Government of India initiating those measures, and of the replies of the Secretary of State in Council confirming the annexation, with any dissents in either case;

And whether he would include a copy of the treaty by which Jhalawar was established as a separate State in 1838.

Lord G. HAMILTON: My answer to both questions is in the affirmative; but I must await the final report of the Government of India on the arrangements made before I can undertake to lay the papers on the Table.

THE POONA OUTRAGES.

PROFESSOR GOKHALE'S RETRACTION.

Sir MANCHERJE BROWNAGREE asked the Secretary of State for India whether Mr. Gokhale had withdrawn, by official communication to the Bombay Government, the statements which he made to certain members of this House and to a newspaper reporter last month regarding the alleged atrocities perpetrated by the officers and soldiers engaged in plague relief operations in Poona; and, if so, would he give such communication or the main purport of it to the House.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Yes Sir; the Governor of Bombay

telegraphed on the August 2 that he had received from Mr. Gokhale the following telegram. The words are: "Have just posted full statement containing explanation, full retraction, and unqualified apology."

I also directed enquiries to be made as to the authenticity of the signatures attached to a large memorial which the hon. baronet the member for Banff introduced to the notice of the House, and upon which it was proposed to move the adjournment of the House. Lord Sandhurst's reply is as follows:

"Deccan Sabha petition. Of the 1,699 signatures, 721 have been examined; of these only 144 could be found, the remaining 677 not being found or traceable, and not known. Of the 144 found, 14 deny their signatures; the rest say they were induced by agents of the Deccan Sabha and the *Dnyan Prakash* newspaper to sign a petition about plague measures, but 50 did not know what they were signing. Different objects held out: more street lamps; for fixing price of grain; against additional taxation; reduction of market rents. Bhide, first signatory, admits he worked with troops from first to last, never missing a day of his turn to accompany search parties, and that he never saw any misconduct. Nawab Abdul Khan says he signed in his private capacity, never having seen memorial, knowing nothing of its contents, and never having seen any misconduct. He has been deposed from place of leader of Muhammadan community, the Muhammadans denying that they have any complaint to make against plague operations."

INDIAN COLLIERIES.

Mr. HENRY KIMBER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was correctly reported to have stated, in answer to a question on the July 30, that no royalties were paid by Indian Collieries to the Government, except in Assam and Burma.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I regret that by an oversight my answer was as stated by the honourable member. It should have been stated that the Nerbudda Coal Company pays a royalty to Government, and its coal may compete with the Umaria coal. The directors of that Company have represented to me that such competition is not fair to them, and I am now in correspondence with them on the subject.

ENTERIC FEVER AT AGRA.

Sir J. FRERGUSON (on behalf of Colonel Kenyon-Slaney) asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether in the 2nd Battalion York and Lancaster Regiment, stationed at Agra, there were, between 23rd February and 27th June, 1897, 77 admissions into hospital from enteric fever, resulting in the deaths of 1 officer and 18 non-commissioned officers and men; whether he could state how many cases of enteric fever were developed in the military hospital by men under treatment for venereal and other diseases; and whether he would institute an inquiry into the causes of this outbreak, and into the water supply.

Mr. BRODRICK: The returns received from Agra do not extend beyond April 30th. During the months of February, March, and April there appear to have been 63 admissions from the 2nd battalion York and Lancaster Regiment for enteric fever and 12 deaths, the great outbreak having occurred in April. There are no returns to show how many cases were developed in hospital in men suffering from other diseases. A special investigation was immediately instituted with the result that the water supplied by the municipal authorities has been found to be infected with the enteric microbe. Every possible precaution has been taken; and it was stated in the report for April that the epidemic seemed to be abating.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

THE USUAL OFFICIAL OPTIMISM.

LORD G. HAMILTON ON "METEOROLOGICAL PHENOMENA" AND "PROBLEMS AHEAD."

On the motion to go into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts,

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON rose to make the annual statement as to the finances of India. He said: I think it would be for the convenience of the House that I should make my statement on the motion that you, Sir, leave the Chair. As

there are a number of motions on the Paper, some of them important, it is clear it would be better that the House should have an authoritative statement on the finances rather than that we should occupy the earlier hours of the sitting discussing matters which, however important they may be, are scarcely relevant to my statement. When last year I had the honour of making the annual Indian financial statement in this House, I was able to associate it with a series of very satisfactory results. For the first time for some years the Secretary of State was able to point to realised surpluses of income over expenditure for the first two of the three years he was dealing with, and as regards the third year there was a reasonable prospect of the outcome of that year becoming even more satisfactory than the ascertained results of the two preceding years. I was also able to show that Indian credit had never before been so high, and that we proposed to associate with this increased power of borrowing an enlarged scheme of reproductive public works. A statement such as I was then able to make would, if it had come from the mouth of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, have been an almost certain herald of some remission of taxation in the forthcoming financial year. I warned the public against putting any such optimistic interpretation upon my speech. I pointed out that the sources of taxation in India were few, and could not be increased; that, independent of the ordinary emergencies to which all civilised governments may be subject, there were in India special dangers and difficulties which might, almost without warning, cause a sudden and heavy drain upon her treasures. I, therefore, indicated that whilst some remission of existing taxation might be possible, if no untoward events intervened, no permanent remission of any individual tax would be safe or desirable. All subsequent speakers, with scarcely an exception, accepted these views. At the time I spoke I had just received an unpleasant intimation from India that the meteorological phenomena of 1897 curiously resembled those of the great famine year of 1877-78, and, although I did not feel justified in giving publicly substance to these shadowy predictions, they were present in my mind during the whole of that debate. Unfortunately, they have been more than verified. The famine of 1896-97 has affected a larger area, and scarcity has been felt by a larger proportion of the population, than in any similar visitation of which we have record in this century. But it did not come alone. Plague with all its attendant horrors and miseries fastened on the west-coast of India, and thus the Government have had to deal simultaneously with two of the most terrible scourges that can assail humanity. It is difficult to dissociate the losses caused by these two separate visitations, so as to accurately apportion to each the loss entailed by it upon the Exchequer. Putting on one side the loss of life, the misery, and the suffering inflicted upon the community, as well as their personal pecuniary losses, we calculate the actual financial loss caused by these disasters to the Government Treasury alone for the two years 1896-97 and 1897-98 at about Rs. 12,000,000. Great as this sum is, it excludes all advances, amounting to about Rs. 2,000,000, which we believe will be recoverable. Neither does it include any estimate of the loss and ruin caused by the earthquake in Bengal and Assam, as that calamity has occurred so recently and has affected so large a territory that we have no reliable estimate of the approximate damage. Therefore in the statements of revenue and expenditure with which I am about to deal, covering three years' finance, the House must remember that, in addition to frontier war expenditure, famine and plague have placed a drain of no less than 12 crores upon the Indian Exchequer, and that the whole of this loss has been met out of Indian treasures within the space of two years, and without the imposition of any additional taxation. The closed accounts of 1895-96 can be dismissed in a few sentences; they were not affected by plague or famine, but they do include the whole cost of the Chitral campaign—namely, Rs. 1,670,000. Notwithstanding this war expenditure, they give a realised surplus of Rs. 1,533,998. This result is all the more remarkable inasmuch as, in addition to the Chitral expenditure, in the course of the year a considerable sum was added to famine insurance, a remission of taxation occurred, and a much larger grant was made for provincial purposes to the local governments than was budgeted for originally. These sums amounted in the aggregate to about Rs. 1,200,000, making, with the Chitral expenditure, a sum of about Rs. 2,870,000, of which Rs. 2,725,000 was unprovided for in the original estimates of expenditure, and had to be added to

them. Yet, notwithstanding these extra charges, the closed accounts of the year showed a surplus of Rs. 1,534,000 as against a Budget Estimate of Rs. 48,000. I mention these facts to show that there is in our Indian system of finance considerable elasticity, more than sufficient to meet the growth of ordinary wants, and it is due to the steady enhancement of almost every branch of revenue that we are able to show in a triennial period such as that with which I am dealing, deficits very much less than the extraordinary expenditure thrust upon us. I now come to the first of the famine years, to the revised accounts for the year 1896-97. Originally the Indian Government Budget showed revenue to the amount of Rs. 61,053,200, and expenditure Rs. 60,590,100, showing a surplus of Rs. 463,100; but the revised estimate, including famine expenditure, was not so satisfactory. The revenue is reduced to Rs. 58,084,200, and the expenditure to Rs. 60,021,100, showing a deficit of Rs. 1,936,900. Analysing these figures, we find that the revenue has increased by Rs. 3,019,000, and that the expenditure is less by Rs. 569,000; so that the position is worse by Rs. 2,450,000, there being an estimated deficit of Rs. 1,986,900 in place of the original estimated surplus of Rs. 463,100. Now, this change is entirely brought about by the famine, through which, as compared with a normal condition of affairs, the finances suffered by loss of revenue alone Rs. 3,029,500, and the increase of expenditure in consequence of the famine was also upwards of three millions—Rs. 3,045,600. Taking these two together, we have a total deterioration of Rs. 6,075,100. Now, as those who study Indian finance are aware, a certain portion of the famine expenditure falls upon the provincial funds, and the provincial and local balances bear Rs. 514,700 of this expenditure, while there is withdrawn from the Grant for Protection Works Rs. 476,300. Therefore, the net cost imposed upon the Indian Government this year in consequence of the famine is Rs. 5,024,100 in excess of the preceding year. But there were also other alterations in the revenue which are worth notice. There was a reduction of the opium revenue of Rs. 420,100; and this, added to the Imperial loss under famine, gives a total deterioration of Rs. 5,444,200. Towards meeting this there are certain improvements. In exchange (the rate for the year having proved to be 14-454d., or nearly 1s. 2½d. per rupee, against the Budget Estimate of 1s. 1½d.) there was a benefit on the expenditure side of the account of Rs. 1,728,600. Then, independent of exchange, famine, and opium, there was a reduction of net expenditure of Rs. 364,700, bringing the total to Rs. 1,143,500, and there was also an increase of revenue to the amount of Rs. 354,700, bringing the total improvements to Rs. 1,498,200. Putting this with the gain on exchange, but deducting Rs. 232,600 of the increased Revenue credited to Provincial Governments, we get an improvement of Rs. 2,994,200, which, deducting from it the extra cost entailed by the famine and the loss on opium, makes the position worse by Rs. 2,450,000. Thus, a surplus of Rs. 463,103 is converted into a deficit of Rs. 1,986,900. Since these figures were prepared, I have received further information as to the accounts, which have now been closed. They are somewhat better. The actual deficit for 1896-97 is expected to be Rs. 1,593,500, which is less by Rs. 393,400 than previously stated. Let me sum up these figures. They are rather complicated, but I hope the House will be able to follow me. (Hear, hear.) The upshot of the whole transaction is this—that for this year the famine imposed upon India an extra charge of Rs. 5,962,800. The actual deficit was Rs. 1,593,500. Therefore, the excess of loss caused by the famine over deficit is Rs. 4,369,300. This second year, therefore, again exhibits the same phenomenon as the preceding year—a large surplus over ordinary expenditure, endorsing the results of the preceding year, and showing there is a large margin of income over ordinary expenditure to meet the special charges to which a country like India is ever subject. I shall not compare the Budget Estimate of this year with the Budget Estimate of last year, which is the usual practice, for such a comparison would be a mere waste of time. The Budget of last year was prepared before the likelihood of a famine was known, and famine has entirely upset the Budget calculations. I take, therefore, the revised Estimates of 1896-97, which are famine estimates, and compare them with the Budget Estimates of 1897-98, which are similarly disorganised. The revenue this year is taken at Rs. 59,629,700, and the expenditure is taken at Rs. 62,093,700. The deficit is thus Rs. 2,464,000, or Rs. 477,100 more than last year. This increase in the deficit is mainly due to the increase in the expenditure on famine relief outweighing the

augmentation hoped for in the revenue. The revenue, taking the land tax, the salt tax, and various other things, is increased by Rs. 2,485,300. On the other hand, there are certain deductions to be made on account of a falling off from other sources of revenue, with the details of which I will not trouble the House, amounting to Rs. 889,800. Therefore the net revenue is better by Rs. 1,595,500. The increase in expenditure on the famine account is Rs. 1,663,300; and other charges are slightly in excess of last year by the sum of Rs. 419,300, giving a total increase over last year's estimate of Rs. 2,072,600. Therefore, summing up the three years, we have a surplus in the first of Rs. 1,534,000, a deficit in the second of Rs. 1,593,000, and an estimated deficit in the third of Rs. 2,464,000, making a total excess of expenditure over income for the three years of Rs. 2,523,000. Since then I have learnt by telegraph that the charges for this year will be increased by Rs. 400,000 for famine charges, the railway loan by Rs. 160,000, that the discount on the sterling loan is Rs. 180,000, that the Tochi expedition is estimated to cost Rs. 330,000, and that the cost of the Malakand expeditionary force will be Rs. 400,000, making a total of Rs. 1,460,000. Against this may be put a rise in exchange and more promising harvest prospects, so that I am hopeful that at the close of the year's account the ultimate deficiency will not be much in excess of that budgeted for at the beginning of the year. In order to meet the extraordinary expenditure of the famine and to carry out the railway programme, it was estimated in the Budget that a loan of four crores at 3 per cent. would be raised in India, and loans to the extent of £4,500,000 would be raised in this country. We have been compelled somewhat to alter this proportion; three crores only will be raised in India at 3½ per cent., in place of the four at 3 per cent., and the loans in this country will be raised *pro tanto* to make good the difference. Before I part with the revenue and expenditure for 1897-98, there is an item on each side to which I should like to call attention. The opium revenue this year is taken at a less figure than in any preceding Budget statement. There were many of us who, although we had no objection, from a moral point of view, to the Indian Government deriving a certain portion of its income from opium, yet felt, considering how precarious is the nature of that revenue, that it formed too large a percentage of the total net revenue of India. It has greatly fallen of recent years. In 1883-84 it formed 19 per cent. of the total net revenue of India, and this year it only represents 5 per cent. It is, therefore, satisfactory to note that, whilst Indian revenue generally is increasing, this precarious source of income is forming a less proportion of the permanent income upon which the Indian Government can rely. (Hear, hear.) The army expenditure for this year—that is, independent of the expeditionary forces in the Tochi Valley and the Malakand—was Rs. 100,000 less than in the preceding year. It is frequently assumed that our army has attained undue dimensions, and that the country is taxed unreasonably for gigantic military establishments. We have in India some 75,000 European troops and 140,000 native troops. These in the aggregate stand to the civil population in the proportion of 11 to every 10,000, and the proportion will be lower if we include the population of the Native States. In the Russian territory of Asia their army stands in the proportion to the civil population of 137 to 10,000, or 12 times higher than the proportion the Indian army bears to the civil population. France maintains 894 and Germany 662 soldiers to every 10,000 of the civil population, and in this country we maintain 147 soldiers to the same proportion of the civil population. It is clear, therefore, that, looking at the population and the area of territory in which they have to work, the army is extremely small. It should be remembered that the only security that India has for the continued preservation of peace and tranquillity is the knowledge that there is one paramount Power possessing sufficient power to suppress all disorderly elements. This army is not an element of aggression or of menace to others, but it is the guardian of the industry and well-being of the peaceful masses, and protects them from the spoliation and exaction to which, for centuries previous to the advent of our rule in India, they were ever subject. But if our army is small it is very efficient. It is admitted on all hands that our European regiments in India have attained a very high standard of efficiency, and many of the native regiments are little behind them. We had a specimen of the native forces in the delegation of officers who came over as an escort to the Queen at her Jubilee. (Hear,

hear.) They met with an enthusiastic reception, which they most heartily appreciated, as was shown by the thanks which, through me as Secretary of State, they returned to the people of England for their kindness and hospitality. In the short period that has elapsed since then the native army has twice been tried—in the Tochi Valley and at the Malakand Kot, where they were the only troops engaged. On both occasions they showed an admirable spirit and unflinching loyalty. It must be gratifying to the people of this country to know that their reception of these gallant representatives of the Indian army was in no sense misjudged, and that, even in the short interval since the Jubilee, that army has given fresh proof of its loyalty and heroism. (Hear, hear.) It will doubtless be suggested that the recent fighting that has occurred in these two places has proved the unwisdom of the policy of frontier extension. It is no doubt inconvenient that the cost of two expeditionary forces should have to be defrayed in this year of exceptional financial difficulty; but no one expected, when we extended our sphere of influence over these territories, that the tribes would at once abandon their predatory and pugnacious habits. There is only one method by which the tribes along our Indian frontier can be permanently weaned from their old malpractices, and that is to so improve their material condition that they will not risk the advantages they have thus gained for the mere fun of fighting. The opening and making of the road from the Malakand to Chitral has greatly improved the material prosperity of all in the valley, and, although the inhabitants of that district may be subject to sudden outbreaks of fanatical zeal, I am confident that, under the steady pressure of improved circumstances, they will follow the example of the other tribes, with whom we have had to deal similarly, and gradually become friendly and well-to-do neighbours. During the last 20 years the system of financial decentralisation has made great strides in India, and every five years a revision takes place in the financial relations between the central and the provincial Governments. This quinquennial alteration took place in the year 1897, and as the division and of expenditure and income arrived at between the two authorities has excited much local interest and criticism, I will in a few sentences explain the principles of the system. By far the greater part of the revenue is collected by the officers of the Provincial Governments, and a very large portion of the civil expenditure is under their control. It is, therefore, highly desirable that the Provincial Governments should have a direct interest in the effective collection of the one and in the economical administration of the other. With this view the Government of India enters into agreements with the Provincial Governments, usually for five years at a time, under which the latter receive certain proportions of the main sources of revenue, together with nearly all the departmental receipts, and bear the responsibility of the whole or a fixed proportion of the charges under most of the heads. The probable position of the several local governments is then carefully examined, and a specific sum in each case (adjusted for convenience under the head of land revenue) is either added to or deducted from the amount of the provincial revenues. In the quinquennial settlements made with the Provincial Governments in 1892 they were allowed as the net amount of expenditure Rs. 13,066,500. In the new settlements this is raised to Rs. 14,355,900, excluding Upper Burma, which is now for the first time provincialised. Including it, the total is Rs. 15,628,900. The expenditure being thus determined, revenue is assigned to each local government accordingly. But the circumstances of the several Provinces have further to be considered, with the view of seeing whether on the one hand, owing to the state of their balances, it is necessary to give them an addition to their revenue or a special grant at the commencement of a new settlement; or whether, on the other hand, their finances admit of the withdrawal of some part of the increase that has occurred under the provincialised heads of revenue, so as to give a share of the improvement to the general finances. In the former class on this occasion comes the Central Provinces, Lower Burma, Assam, the Punjab, and the North-Western Provinces; from none of these is money withdrawn, and in some cases additional grants are made in order to replenish the balances. In the more flourishing provinces, however, of Bengal, Madras and Bombay the Government of India have claimed some part of the increase, though there is much dispute both as to the amount remaining for the provincial revenues and as to its adequacy. Around the latter point a great controversy has arisen. These provinces complain

bitterly of the check to progress if they are not allowed the full amount to which their revenue in the previous period had attained, and Sir Alexander Mackenzie in the Viceroy's Council last year, and Sir Arthur Havelock in his own council this year, have vigorously protested against the proportions of the revenues assigned. On the other hand, Sir James Westland and the Viceroy strongly maintain the right of the Provincial Government, from the commencement of the provincial system, to share, when each five years' agreement has expired, in the growth of the revenue which had been assigned to the local governments for that period, and they point out that only by such control can any chance arise of lightening the taxpayers' burdens. The controversy raised by these settlements is very interesting, for it goes to the very root of financial devolution and the respective responsibilities and the relative importance of the work done by the two contracting parties. Upon the Imperial Government rests the primary duty of maintaining order internally and of protecting the frontiers; of the risk of war, famine, exchange, and sudden emergencies; of the responsibility of maintaining not only national solvency, but also the solvency of the Provincial Governments. It is, moreover, their business, whenever they can, to remit or abolish taxation. On the Provincial Governments, on the other hand rests, the duty of developing the resources of their respective provinces, and by so developing them to add to the general prosperity, comfort and taxable power of the community at large. The number of objects associated with these purposes is ever increasing, and the expenditure involved by them ever growing. In this country we know how local expenditure has increased much more rapidly than Imperial expenditure; and this is not due to inherent extravagance of the bodies controlling this expenditure, but to the inevitable result that, as civilisation and prosperity increase, so the functions of local authorities are raised to a higher standard of duty and ambition. (Hear, hear.) In this country, however, the great bulk, if not the whole, of this expenditure falls directly upon the ratepayers, and this acts as a natural check upon undue development of expenditure; but if the great bulk of the expenditure fell, not upon local rates, but upon portions of Imperial revenues, the House would easily understand that local wants and local expenditure would develop with extraordinary rapidity. It is most desirable to extend financial decentralisation in India, and it is only by constant development of this principle that the ever-increasing burden of administration in India can be adequately met. But, on the other hand, a margin, and a large margin, of revenue must be left to the Imperial Government to meet emergencies and to reduce taxation. The present scheme is not yet settled, and still is under the consideration of the Government. I fully admit the force of the objections urged against it by the Provincial Governments but, on the other hand, I have seen no scheme, nor has any been suggested to me, which is less free from objection. I hope, however, that we may be able, by carefully considering both sides of this problem, to arrive at some conclusion which will prevent in future the feeling of irritation and annoyance which undoubtedly at the present moment is experienced by several of the Provincial Administrations. (Hear, hear.) I now turn to the three great calamities which have visited India during the last 12 months—earthquake, plague, and famine. The effects of the earthquake were entirely confined to the provinces of Bengal and Assam. It is now clear that the loss of life was much exaggerated, and that it should be numbered by hundreds rather than by the thousands whom it was originally stated had perished in this catastrophe. (Hear, hear.) The loss of property, however, is great in many parts of the country. All masonry buildings have been destroyed, and bridges, railways, and roads have been greatly damaged; but the loss has mainly fallen on the well-to-do. It is the planters and manufacturers and the employers of labour who have lost heavily. The mat huts of the natives can be easily restored, and the demand for labour is great, and wages are high; so much is this the case that the Commissioner of Assam informed the Viceroy that there was no need of a relief fund for the benefit of this province. Still, I fear that this disaster will have a pernicious and deterrent effect upon the subsequent investment of capital in this part of India, and a considerable check will be given to the development of this rich but sparsely inhabited province. The outbreak of plague in Western India in one sense caused even greater apprehension to the authorities than the knowledge that scarcity and

famine would attack a large area of territory. It is true that scarcity and famine might and did afflict a very much larger proportion of the population, and caused much more suffering and distress; but the methods by which it could be met were known and were appreciated, and the Government could rely upon hearty co-operation from every section of the community in their endeavours to mitigate the evil. But these conditions were all reversed when it became necessary to deal with plague. The only methods by which its growth could be arrested were repugnant to the instincts, customs, and usages of the great mass of the native population, and they interfered with the privacy of their home life. At the outset of plague, Government had to consider the only two alternative courses which were open to them. They might have allowed the plague to run its course, and thus avoided all the unpopularity and disturbance which might be provoked by any attempt to stamp it out. But if they had adopted this course, not only would it have been a cowardly derogation of duty, but it might and probably would have involved the industrial and economic ruin of India. It is impossible to exaggerate the intensity of the alarm caused everywhere by a knowledge of the outbreak of this disease. If plague had once been allowed to fasten upon India, looking at the area of its territory and the vastness of its population, it would have been many years before this pestilence could have been extirpated. During the whole of that period India would have been boycotted by the world. The danger ahead in India in my judgment is not insufficiency of food, but insufficiency of employment for her rapidly-increasing millions. Industries are gradually springing up, and an exporting trade is slowly developing of inestimable benefit in giving employment of a varied character. The establishment of plague in India would have not only caused terrible mortality and great distress in the districts which it visited, but it would have deprived many millions of persons outside these districts of the employment which they now obtain. The Government, therefore, had no choice but to do their best to stamp out the plague—(cheers)—and the only method by which plague can be so eradicated, is by the segregation of the sick and house-to-house visitation. Both these principles came into contact with the hereditary customs and traditions of Oriental life. The people were at first alarmed, but the patience and kindness shown by the officers in charge of these operations soon reassured them—(hear, hear)—and no serious difficulty occurred anywhere in the West of India except at Poona. In Poona, unfortunately there is a clique of some of the descendants of those who, at the commencement of this century, controlled a considerable portion of India. They have ever been hostile to British rule, and they have never lost any opportunity of stirring up discontent and disaffection against the authorities. They promptly availed themselves of this occasion, and, by gross and wilful distortion of the acts of the officers of the search party employed at Poona, they contrived to produce the feeling which resulted in the murder of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst. Both these officers were done to death by the spread of wilful and malicious falsehoods. I trust that there will be no recrudescence of this pestilence in the ensuing autumn. The Government will show every respect for the feelings, the traditions, and even the prejudices of the native community in any further action they may take for the suppression of plague. Any improper acts of those under its authority will be promptly punished; but if, on behalf of the Indian Government, I enter into this undertaking, I think I have a right to ask for some reciprocity. (Hear, hear.) India is the land of exaggeration, of romance, and of imagination. Ordinary prosaic acts are there expanded by high-flown exaggerated language to proportions which, to our commonplace minds, seem almost incredible. I am sure I am not asking too much of those who take an interest in the proceedings of the Government of India to be most careful before they give currency to the statements reflecting upon the action of the officers associated with the discharge of plague duties, to investigate the sources of their information, and to believe no statements made to them until they are satisfied that they rest on indisputable authority. (Hear, hear.) The dimensions of the late famine and scarcity were considerably greater than that which occurred twenty years ago in 1877-78, and a comparison between the two may be interesting. The area of square miles affected by famine in 1877 was 267,000; in 1897, 322,000. The population of the famine area in the first period was 58,000,000; the population this

year 68,000,000; and the highest number receiving relief at one time in 1877 was 3,178,000; in 1897, 4,224,000. There is a marked difference in the characteristics of the two famines. In 1877 there were two separate and distinct famine districts, one in Northern India and one in Southern India. The distress extended over a period of eighteen months, but the culmination of distress in Southern India was many months in advance of the period at which distress attained its height in Northern India. There was an intense pressure from an absence of food in both districts, caused by an almost complete failure of the crops; but in districts outside the crops were good, and surpluses of food for the districts were, to a large extent, available. The peculiarity of the famine of last year was an almost universal shortness of rain. Crops in only a few districts—Bundelcund and the Central Provinces—were a complete failure, but almost everywhere they were a partial failure. British India is divided into 250 administrative districts. No less than 115 of these districts were classified as famine districts, although no district comes into that category unless it has upwards of 10,000 persons upon relief works. Of the districts outside, few, except those in Burma, had any large spare surplus of food; and thus the usual experience of famine administration was reversed. There was a great falling off in the railway receipts, instead of the increase which in previous famines was associated with the carriage of food by railway. Under conditions such as these, it would have been assumed that great imports of food from abroad would have come into India, that a very high death-rate would have prevailed in the districts where great famine relief works were instituted, and that it would have been possible to obtain an unlimited quantity of labour of low grade. Such anticipations, however, were not fulfilled. High prices, according to the Indian standard, prevailed over an enormous area, but they were not relatively high when compared by the standard of prices in other countries. At the commencement of the scarcity a large shipment of wheat from America arrived in Calcutta and Bombay. Every sale connected with this in India was made at a loss, and ultimately a very large proportion of it was sent back to this country, where it obtained a higher price and a better market. And, as a matter of fact, prices in India, even at the worst period of the famine, were too low to encourage imports of food from outside. As to the death rate, in 1877 it was terribly high; but this year, although great distress and suffering and a high death rate prevailed in the North-West Provinces and the Central Provinces, the death rate in the famine districts of Bengal, Madras, and the Punjab was normal, and even in those districts where the death rate was high, it was almost entirely due to the reluctance of the people to come in until too late, or to constant and severe outbreaks of cholera. As to the condition of the labouring masses, the Government railway programme was greatly enlarged last year, and I hear from all sides that there has been during the past autumn in India a greater difficulty in getting the requisite amount of labour for these works than existed in the preceding years. The explanation of this apparent anomaly lies in the immense improvement which has taken place in working the system of famine relief. A subsistence allowance was given to every man and to every member of his family who applied for relief, and this allowance in the aggregate not infrequently exceeded the remuneration which the man alone from his labour could obtain from ordinary employment. No praise can be too high for the splendid work of the local officers in combating famine. It is a splendid record of administrative philanthropy, and all noted with pleasure the exceptional honour which Her Majesty was pleased to bestow on Sir Antony MacDonnell, on whom fell heavier labours and greater responsibility than on any other official superintending famine operations. One illustration of the excellent management and organisation, is that, although there were at one time more than one million of persons receiving relief, or in relief camps, in the North-West Provinces, Sir Antony MacDonnell so employed the people themselves in maintaining order, that it was not necessary to increase the ordinary police force of the North-West by the addition of a single constable. The appeal made at the commencement of the year for subscriptions in Great Britain and the rest of the Empire, met with a response of extraordinary generosity. The total amount subscribed in Great Britain, India, and elsewhere, amounted to the largest sum ever collected in connexion with any Indian object. Some valuable reports will be published giving details of the administration and

distribution of this fund. These reports, and those emanating from the officials in charge of relief, will, no doubt, offer many excellent suggestions, and I have little doubt that out of the experience of the present year such an improvement will be made in the already effective famine code as will make its administration in any future famine as great an improvement upon the work of this year as this year's work was upon the administration of 20 years back. But in connexion with famine and plague administration there is one fact to which I feel bound to call prominent attention. It is only in times of emergency and difficulty that it is possible to test the reserve latent strength in any given executive system of administration. It was soon found that the pivot upon which everything depended in any large administrative district was the European officer. Wherever that element was absent it had to be supplied, thus confirming the almost universal experience of preceding emergencies, which show that a mere capacity for passing a competitive examination cannot compensate for those qualities which are inherent in, or are obtained from, race, training, or instinct. It has been urged by some that the increased area affected by famine this year was due to the increased poverty of the community, and that although relief administration had greatly improved upon the system in force 20 years ago, the people themselves, so far as their powers of resistance are concerned, would have stood this test better 20 years back; and it is further contended that the scarcity of food this year in India is due to the constant and ever-increasing amount of exports from India. I venture to point out that all evidence tends in the opposite direction. It is quite true that the exports of India have very largely increased in the last 20 years; but if I take the average exports of the three years preceding the famine of 1877-78, and of the three years preceding the famine of last year, I find these results: The exports of food other than rice have only increased to a small amount; but the non-eatable exports during that period have increased from Rs. 37,000,000 to Rs. 75,700,000, and this increase is almost entirely in tea, jute, cotton, oil-seeds, indigo, and other non-eatable exports. Moreover, in the interval between the two famines, India has imported and retained no less than Rs. 208,000,000 of gold and silver. The maximum number of persons upon relief at any one time was 4,200,000 persons—a very large number, but not very large in proportion to the population of 250,000,000. (Hear, hear.) The number of persons in this country who are permanently in receipt of poor relief is proportionately much greater than the maximum number on relief works during the worst period of the late famine in India. (Hear, hear.) I hear from all the officers who were connected with famine administration that they noted with surprise the manner in which the mass of the community withstood the hard times. At the same time I readily admit that the advance in the material prosperity of the individual is checked by the enormous aggregate increase of the population. It is estimated that the increase in India of population is above 2,000,000 a year. India is almost a purely agricultural country, and a cardinal feature in our policy should be to multiply and vary industrial occupations, and render this ever-increasing population less dependent upon the vagaries of the rainfall of one year. Now various suggestions from high authorities have been recently made for the attainment of this object. It is suggested that we should largely alter the system of land tenure, with a view of increasing the period of settlement or of substituting fixity of tenure for the shorter periods now in force. Within the famine area of last year is comprised every conceivable form of land tenure from the zemindari settlement of Bengal to the ryotwari settlement of Bombay and Madras; and from enquiries made it is clear that no one particular form of settlement was more effective than another in enabling the people to withstand the pressure of high prices. In 1874 the permanently settled districts of Chumparum and Sarum suffered more severely and had many more people on relief than the neighbouring temporarily settled district of Goruckpore. In the present famine the temporarily settled district of Goruckpore had 30,000 people, or 1 per cent. of its population, on relief, while Sarum had 180,000, or 10 per cent. of its population, on relief. Again, going South I find that Ganjam, a permanently settled district of Madras, has suffered more severely and more often from famine than any of the temporarily settled districts of that Presidency. At the present time Ganjam has 66,000 people, or 3 per cent. of its population, on relief, whilst the adjoining

temporary settlement of Pooree has only 5,000, or $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of its population, upon relief. I do not contend that the permanently settled districts, as such, suffer more severely in famine than temporarily settled districts; but this instance and many others might be given to support the view that the permanence of land revenue demand does not enable the people to endure the pressure of famine more easily than the inhabitants of temporarily settled districts. It is next suggested to us that we should embark on a large irrigation policy, and I received a large number of requests from members of Parliament to at once sanction the outlay. Twenty years ago a Committee of this House, of which I was chairman, made a most exhaustive enquiry as to how far irrigation works of great magnitude could be usefully extended in India. Upon that Committee were Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Arthur Balfour, Mr. Childers, Sir George Campbell, Mr. John Cross, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Mulholland, and Mr. Edward Stanhope, and we were unanimous in the conclusions at which we arrived. Agriculture in certain parts of India is impossible without irrigation. In all such districts irrigation, if it be associated with a constant supply of water, is an enormous benefit, and this is shown by the very large returns which canals in the Punjab and Sindh give on their original outlay. There are other districts, such as the North-West Provinces, in which may be found large tracts which can be very beneficially irrigated; but no irrigation has paid its expenses in Lower Bengal or Orissa, and in the greater part of Bombay and Bengal the lack of rain and the physical configuration of the country have prevented irrigation works of great magnitude. The Indian Government are now spending annually Rs. 750,000 upon great irrigation works, and the local governments have an absolutely free hand, so far as their revenues are concerned, in promoting small works of irrigation; and every engineer who has had great practical experience of irrigation confirms the view, taken by this Committee some 20 years ago, that the localities or area in which great new irrigation works can be undertaken with advantage is becoming exhausted, and it will be a waste of ways and means to embark in anything like the wholesale expenditure which after every famine we find pressed upon us. On the other hand, the extension of railroads, wherever undertaken after proper surveys, have been of great benefit not only to the districts through which they run, but to the community at large. They facilitate migration, they greatly increase the area of cultivation, they develop the mineral wealth of the country, and open up new industries. They are a most effective preventive of death from starvation by their carrying power in time of famine and distress, and in years of prosperity they are the most reliable instrument for the augmentation and distribution of wealth, and, so far as the recuperative powers of the mass of the people are concerned, they are the readiest agency the Government can employ. Last year I announced to the House that we proposed to largely increase the railway programme of expenditure for the next three years, and during that period there were to be constructed by the State about 5,000 miles, costing Rs. 29,665,000 and by private companies 2,626 miles, costing Rs. 16,182,000, making an aggregate of 7,626 miles and Rs. 45,847,000 of expenditure. After consultation with the Viceroy, we have determined to adhere, as far as we possibly can, to this increased outlay—(hear, hear)—though it may be necessary for the present year to reduce our proposed expenditure by one crore; but I believe, for the reasons I have already stated, that the prosecution of this policy will be a most effective famine preventive instrument, and one which should be vigorously pushed through, even although it may occasion for the moment some financial inconvenience. (Hear, hear.) The year of 1897 will long be notable for the continuous series of misfortune and difficulty which it has presented to India. In no year since the transfer of the government of India to the Crown have there been so many troubles packed so closely together in so short a time. In combating these difficulties the brunt of the responsibility and action has fallen upon the Viceroy. (Hear, hear.) Lord Elgin has not the advantage, which several of his predecessors enjoyed, of being well-known to the British public by prominent services in other capacities before he became Viceroy. All who know him or have conducted business with him know that he is a man of great capacity and high courage and, in addition, possesses to a pre-eminent degree the advantage of a judicial and well-balanced mind. (Cheers.) He has faced his difficulties with sound judgment, with unflinching courage,

and with unbroken success. (Hear, hear.) He and his Council have been ably supported by the Governors of the various Presidencies and provinces; and the civil and military services have nobly responded to the heavy additional duties placed upon them. The mistakes, made have been few, and where made have been promptly remedied and not repeated. When, in the limited tenure of office of a Viceroy or Governor, difficulties of long growth come to a head through their own natural development nothing can be more unfair than to attribute blame to the official who, by the accident of the moment, has to deal with the outcome of the past. (Hear, hear.) It is 40 years since the administration of India passed to the direct control of the Crown, and the retrospect of work accomplished in that time is, on the whole, pleasant and gratifying. We have dealt most successfully with the difficulties we then inherited, and the India of to-day, compared with the India of 40 years back, has made enormous strides of advance in all the outward essentials of Western civilization. The troubles ahead are not in what we inherited, but in what we of our own free will have created. Under the aegis of peace and order the population is increasing with unprecedented rapidity. Can we open out for this annual host of new mouths fresh avenues of employment and self-support? Whilst we have protected the physique we have also endeavoured to cultivate the intellect of India. An elaborate system of education has been established, culminating in Universities through which thousands of young natives yearly obtain degrees in philosophy and literature, but without any subsequent prospect of livelihood, save at the Bar or in connection with the Press. We have established codes of law and procedure far simpler and more expeditious than those in force in this country, and under their influence India is rapidly becoming the most litigious community in the world. Is it impossible to so alter the current and tendency of the education we give us to associate it with objects of a practical and technical character, by which India's latent resources might be developed, her industries multiplied, and her productive power extended? Can we not make it the ambition of the rising generation to so educate themselves as to be able to do something to benefit the community to which they belong, rather than devote most of their energy to abuse of the Government which has educated and is protecting them? These are some of the problems ahead of us, and, though the year of 1897 may in some senses be looked upon as a year of misfortune, it will not be without its salutary lessons if it teaches us to consider and grapple with these subjects in no spirit of reaction or haste, but with the sole consideration as to what India's true interests demand and what the overwhelming mass of the people want. (Cheers.)

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL'S AMENDMENT.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL rose to move as an amendment: "That this House views with grave disapproval the fact that famine, plague, and pestilence in India have been seized by the Indian Government for an attack on the freedom of the Press in India and for the revival of the system of arrest of British subjects in India under the law of *lettres de cachet*, and the indefinite imprisonment without trial of persons thus arrested; and desires to place on record its conviction that the only safe foundation for government in India is to be sought in the extension to British subjects in India of the full privileges of the British Constitution." He wished to bring home to members of the House and to the people of Great Britain that the fortunes and lives of two hundred and fifty millions of human beings—the vast population of India—had been committed to their charge. From that trust England could not shrink. England had destroyed in India every form of government but her own. She had cast the thrones and government of native Princes down to the ground. She was bound at least to extend justice and mercy to the millions thus brought under her sway. His complaint was that they had delegated that government to agents from whom they sought no account. He would not seek to account for a fact which was patent, that the English people viewed Indian matters with a languid interest. In a former generation India was only known to this country through the medium of the adventurers laden with the spoils of Hindustan, who appeared so prominently in public life, and who in the words of Chatham "brought with them not merely Asiatic luxury, but Asiatic principles of government." At present, India was chiefly known to the

community at large not through the medium of millionaires, but rather through the medium of well-to-do officers and retired Indian civilians. The Government of India was left completely in the hands of officials who were in the words of the Indian Secretary to be given "a free hand." Parliamentary criticism of Indian officers was, since the dissolution of the East India Company in 1858, almost a thing of the past. In former times owing to the grant of the East India Company's Charter being limited to a fixed period of years, there was a full investigation at stated intervals by the House of Commons of the affairs of British India and of the condition of its people. Since British India had come under the direct Government of the Crown, however, Parliament seemed to have ignored its responsibility and abandoned the management of Indian affairs to officials with a callousness as much to be deplored as the conduct of an Irish absentee landlord in abandoning his tenants to the tender mercies of a agent. The discussion of Indian affairs in that House was put off to the very last day of the Session, and this circumstance, highly indicative of neglect, was made the subject of a jest, which was, he thought, unworthy of him, by the First Lord of the Treasury, who when he was asked on July 17 when the Indian Budget would come on for discussion said: "I shall carefully follow precedent in this matter. (Laughter.) I think there is no chance of our being able to take it until we reach the last week of the Session." When the Indian Budget did come on, discussions had as a rule been, in the main, confined to friendly conversations, in an empty House, of an highly interesting character, between experts and ex-Indian officials and the Indian Secretary. Occasionally, indeed, the public mind was startled by some manifestation of popular feeling in India, as in the present state of Poona, and then it was urged in the Press of this country, and was echoed in Parliament, not to enquire into the means which had produced these disturbances, but to coerce the people into bearing in silence and meekness what they believed to be the burden of a wrong. He wanted the people of England to awaken to their responsibility to India. Famine, plague, and pestilence had been seized by the Indian Government for an attack on the freedom of the Press. He would endeavour to bring home to the House what an Indian famine meant. Eighty per cent. of the population were engaged in agricultural occupations, and 40 millions of the people were in a state of semi-starvation. Between 1861 and 1877 half a million of persons per annum died of starvation. The figures were: Upper India, 1861, 500,000; Orissa, Behar, N. Madras 1866, 1,500,000; Rajputana and Central India, 1869, 400,000; Northern India and Bombay, 1876-77, 5,500,000; North-West Provinces, 1877, 8,650,000. Much of the money raised for the last famine was appropriated to little wars. The question irresistibly arose how many lives might have been saved recently if the famine fund had been accumulated for the purpose for which it was designed. Scarcity was one thing, famine was another. He contended that famines would not occur if there was a Government in sympathy with the people. The millions of the poor natives of India were terribly overtaxed. The average income of a native was 1½d. a day. One of the chief causes to which he attributed the famine in India as distinguished from the great poverty of the people was that they had no control whatever over their own expenditure. The vast sums mentioned in the Budget just laid before the House were exacted from them without any opportunity on their part for opposition or resistance. The present Finance Minister of India, speaking in the Governor-General's Council recently, said:—"Other Finance Ministers when they present their statements have to defend the expenditure proposed against the representatives of the taxpayer. Here the position is exactly the reverse. The Finance Minister is the solitary representative of the taxpayers of India." The aim and inclination of the Minister was naturally to get as much money as possible from the people of India. He had no one to say a word on their behalf; he alone represented his victims. The opium traffic was one of the chief sources of revenue. But that traffic would not long continue if it were under popular control in India. Large tracts of land would not be allowed to be diverted from the growth of food and cereals for the purposes of such a traffic. One reason for the poverty of India was that its finances were subject to a constant drain. The Duke of Devonshire, when Secretary for India, admitted that no less than £3,000,000 a year was drained from this impoverished country for pensions and furlough allowances in India and elsewhere. The public

debt of India when we took over the Government from the East India Company was \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000. In 1879 it had increased to £150,000,000. At the present time it was above £180,000,000. The small wars and military expeditions of which he had spoken entailed great expense on the people of India, and was borne exclusively by them. Sir Lepel Griffin in a recent "interview" said it was absolutely necessary to provoke small wars on the confines of India to keep our army up to a proper state of efficiency. Troops were taken away from India for expeditions and service elsewhere, and the expense most unjustly thrown on the finances of India. It was the case with the China Wars, the New Zealand expedition, the Abyssinian War, the Egyptian War, and the Sudan expedition. Then the administration of India was costly. Why? Because the natives, not by law but by practice, were "boycotted" from posts in the Civil Service. Lord Lytton in 1888 wrote that in our policy towards the people of India we had to choose between bullying and cheating them, and it suited us better to cheat them. In 1893 the House adopted a Motion by Mr. Herbert Paul in favour of admitting natives to the Civil Service of India and holding the examinations for the service simultaneously in India and in London. But that Resolution had never been carried into effect by the Government of India although they were supposed to be the servants of the House of Commons. As far as could be the religious and caste feelings of the people should be respected.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Who said they were not?

MR. MACNELL did not say they were not respected, but greater care should have been taken that all their sensibilities should be regarded. The duties of entering the houses ought not to be entrusted to English soldiers who could not regard the religious sensibilities of the people in the way in which those sensibilities should be regarded. In relation to the Press prosecutions he should not say one word in reference to those prosecutions which were pending, although he thought he should be entitled to comment on the delay of the Government in instituting such prosecutions. Some of the articles as to which proceedings were being taken were six months old, and the prosecutions, he alleged, were procured by men in that House. Their first idea should be to protect the people and not to gag the Press. On the question of the Press let him cite the observations of some very eminent judges. What said Sir Richard Garth, late Chief Justice in Bengal, and a former representative of extreme Toryism in that House? Writing in the *Law Magazine and Review* for February, 1896, he said:—"I can only say I read native papers myself week after week, and never see anything there at all approaching sedition or even disloyalty or disrespect to English rule. What I do find there, and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well-deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many of the Government officials. I am afraid this is exactly what the Government would wish to repress. I consider it a most wholesome and salutary means of bringing the misconduct of Government officers to the notice not only of the Indian people but of the courts of justice." Sir William Markby, who was for twelve years an Indian judge, and who was now an esteemed and learned professor at Oxford, wrote to the *Spectator* of July 17 last:—"I should like to add one word on behalf of the native Indian Press, which is, I think, just now getting more abuse than it deserves. I have for years read regularly extracts from a large number of native newspapers. The criticisms I have met with are sometimes severe, but for the most part respectful. There is occasionally strong 'disapprobation,' but very rarely 'disaffection.'" He might explain that "disapprobation" could not be construed into sedition, provided it did not excite to acts of sedition against British rule. As he had said, he did not intend to say one word in reference to the incriminating articles in connexion with the pending press prosecutions, but how had the English press restrained themselves in the matter? He declared that he never looked into an evening paper without seeing what they, in this country, would regard as grave contempt of court with reference to the press prosecutions. Lord Harris had been a Governor of Bombay, and yet he was amazed to see a letter from that noble lord in the *Times* a day or two ago, in which he inferentially denounced the courts for not having convicted certain prisoners in his own time. The last point to which he called attention was the astonishing action of the Government of India and of the noble lord in arresting and imprisoning men under a system of

lettres de cachet. Without any sort of trial the men were imprisoned upon the warrant of the Viceroy, their only offence being that they were what the Viceroy called "dangerous persons." The Secretary for India said this action was taken with his authority, under Ordinance 25 of 1827. This regulation was based on an Ordinance of 1818, and the preamble set forth:—"Whereas, the security of the British dominions from foreign hostility and from internal commotions renders it necessary to place under restraint individuals against whom there may not be sufficient ground to institute any judicial proceeding, or when any such proceeding may not be adapted to the nature of the case, or may, for other reasons, be inadvisable or improper," and it provided for a warrant of committal. Upon a simple warrant of the Viceroy men could be arrested and kept in prison as long as the Viceroy pleased, subject to no controlling influence. And this was in the happy land of India we were loading with benefits! The noble lord, with amazing courage, stated that this action was taken after previous consultation with him; so it would seem that the Indian Government thought that this was so high-handed and tyrannical that they asked for the official sanction of the noble lord. He had been listened to by the House with great patience, and he had discharged his duty, he hoped, without using an offensive word against anyone. He wished the people of India to know that there were persons in Parliament who sympathised with them, and who took largely the same view of the degradation of their country produced by English rule as the natives did themselves; that there were persons who wished to extend to them the privileges and blessings of the British Constitution under which they had to live. In the concluding words of his resolution he desired to place on record his conviction that the only safe foundation for government in India was to be sought in the extension to British subjects in India of the full privileges of the British Constitution. He wished hon. members to have no misconception of his meaning, he wished those privileges to be gradually extended, and first, that personal liberty should be secured. He wished, in the words of Edmund Burke, that freedom should be as much the privilege of the poorest British subject in India as of the British subject in London. That personal freedom the natives of India had not. If we would govern India, not for the good of England, but for the good of India, and that would redound to the good of England, our first duty should be to extend to India justice and mercy, and not to goad her people by intolerable wrong into insurrection, and then providing no remedy for the wrong, drive them by repression into more strenuous resistance. We must not look upon India as a slave owner would look at his plantation. Having this great nation with its ancient civilisation and religious feeling under our charge we should do our best to show them forbearance, kindness, and consideration, giving them a reasonable, rightful measure of management of their own affairs. He moved the Resolution of which he had given notice.

MR. MICHAEL DAVITT.

MR. MICHAEL DAVITT in seconding the motion of his hon. friend, said he was relieved from the necessity of lengthy observations by the fact that the hon. member for South Donegal had travelled fully over the wide area embraced by the terms of the motion. His reason for intervening—his personal reason as a somewhat silent member for intervening in this discussion—was this: he had convinced himself, rightly or wrongly, that the House and the Press outside were unfairly biased against the native Press of India, and some of the leaders of the Indian people in connexion with recent events in the dependency, and he, for one, would raise his humble voice against that violation of the spirit of justice and fairness that held a man, white or black, English or Indian, innocent until proved guilty. They had seen within the last few weeks the detestable Bourbon law of *lettres de cachet* put in force against British subjects in India, and in the House the Secretary of State for India had approved and applauded that policy. Distinguished leaders of the Indian people—one a Sirdar of the Deccan—had been arrested, deported, and sent to prison without having been brought before magistrate, judge, or jury, and such a policy as this should receive condemnation on both sides of the House if there was any sincerity in the professions of English statesmen that they were desirous of ruling India within the spirit, purpose, and meaning of the British Constitution. This policy of the noble lord, this policy

of a Bourbon law, was sought to be defended on the ground that it was necessary to strike terror into people who were disaffected to British rule in India, but he was happy to know that the policy had not succeeded. The Indian people were not terrorised by the resort to a law which brought on the Bourbons of France the destruction of their dynasty, and which, if persisted in in India, he, as an Irishman, trusted would bring to an end English domination in that country. What was alleged as the reason for this high-handed proceeding of the noble lord and his subordinates in India? It was alleged that the law was put in force in consequence of incitations to disaffection and assassination on the part of some of the editors of the native Press in India. He denied there was ground for the allegation. Nothing had been brought before the public in this country in any of the translations he had seen of the comments of the native Press to justify this interpretation. He maintained that the House itself had been guilty in this connexion of a gross act of injustice. On July 15 the hon. member for Bethnal Green (Sir M. Bohnaggee), who occupied a seat in the House, not by the votes of his fellow-countrymen, but as the Unionist representative of a London constituency, thought it consonant with his ideas of justice and regard for his countrymen to put the following question to the Secretary for India: "Whether he was aware that in the last two years an annual celebration to stir up disaffection against England among the natives of India had been set on foot under the designation of the Shivaji Accession ceremony. . . . Whether he was aware that Gungadur Tilak, the editor of the *Mahratta* and *Kesari* newspapers, presided at the celebration and made a speech in which he counselled the murder of Europeans. . . . and whether any steps had been taken by the local authorities to stop such systematic training of large numbers of people and students, and the incitement of them to such actions as led to the assassination of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerat within a week of the last Shivajee celebration?" He ventured to say with all respect to the noble lord the Secretary for India, that in his reply he also, if he would pardon him for saying so, was guilty of a breach of the law of fair play. His reply was an endorsement of the accusation, made without facts, without trial, by the hon. member. The noble lord said: "I am aware that an annual festival has recently been established in commemoration of Shivaji. I have seen a newspaper report of certain speeches made at the festival which took place last month, and it supports the description given in the second and third paragraphs of the question." Surely this was accusing a man and sentencing a man before the law in India had thought fit to touch him? He would ask the House—was there a Minister of her Majesty's Government who would dare to think of doing anything of that kind in connexion with any citizen of Great Britain or Ireland? He was justified in complaining of this want of fairness to a man, against whom the law had been afterwards put in motion. The man against whom these terrible accusations were levelled had received a mark of respect and honour never conferred on the hon. member opposite—he had been nominated twice to the Legislative Council of Bombay, by the central municipal body of that city. He sincerely hoped and trusted that better counsels would prevail in India than those suggested by the hon. member, and he believed there were signs of this. He was convinced that Tilak would get a fair trial notwithstanding that the Anglo-Indian Bar had, in a cowardly manner, declined to defend him on his trial. The cowardly crimes of assassination—and no words of his could be strong enough to condemn them—were exceedingly rare amongst the Indian people. Let them fancy 250 millions of people subject to foreign domination and foreign officialism, and was it to be wondered at that occasionally men would be driven to madness, and resort to abominable crimes of this kind. Let the House picture the difficulties which would confront them if, instead of having to deal with 250 millions of Indians they had to deal with 250 millions of Irishmen. (Laughter.) Their rule and their domination would be submerged, and there would be practically nothing of them left. He pleaded there that day for kinder consideration, fairness, and extenuation towards the native Press and towards the leaders of the people of India. They had shown exemplary patience and endurance, and they ought not to be as lightly condemned on account of one detestable crime as they had been almost universally by the Press of Great Britain. His contention was that the assassinations of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant

Ayerst arose directly from the carrying out of the plague regulations in Poona. The noble lord himself had admitted that these regulations, undertaken, he agreed, with the best purpose in the world, necessarily intruded upon the domestic life of the Indian people. Then, again, soldiers were employed in the performance of this essential work. He asserted that they had heard too many protests of innocence made on behalf of the British soldiers in India. Soldiers were more or less alike in one respect, whether they were British, or Russian, or French, or any other nationality; and, in face of the revelations contained in some of the Blue-books presented to that House about the condition of 60 or 70 per cent. of the British soldiers in India, was it a matter of astonishment or of surprise if one or two soldiers engaged in this work—this humane work, if they would—overstepped the bounds of discretion and morality and gave offence to native sentiment.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: There is no evidence of that.

MR. DAVITT begged the noble lord's pardon. On the 26th July, in reply to a question addressed to him by the hon. and gallant member for Essex, he admitted the substantial accuracy of a statement alluded to in the question taken from the *Daily News*, to the effect that two girls had been assaulted criminally in the segregation inspection camp at Poona.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: No, pardon me. There was an allegation made against two officers at the other end of India, but that had nothing whatever to do with Poona. Every allegation made in reference to misconduct on the part of British officers in Poona has not only not been substantiated, but has been withdrawn and apologised for. (Cheers.)

MR. DAVITT said the noble lord declared in his reply to the question that two officers had been suspended in consequence of the charge brought against them that they had attempted criminally to assault two native girls.

SIR M. BHOWNAGGERE: That was on the Calcutta side.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON was understood to say that if the hon. gentleman would look at his reply, he would see that the transaction had nothing whatever to do with Poona.

MR. DAVITT said his general argument was that they knew what soldiers were, and he thought it was reasonable and fair to assume that soldiers engaged in this delicate and humane work—if they would—might overstep the bounds of propriety and morality. He would not labour that question any further. (Ministerial Cheers.)

DR. TANNEZ: But it is true.

MR. DAVITT asserted that there were grounds for the discontent shown by the native Press of India, and he trusted that rational discontent would continue in the native Press and on the platforms of India until such a change was introduced into the government of the country as was indicated in the motion now before the House. Their only justification for holding India by the sword would be in making it a prosperous and contented country. He contended that they had failed to do that. They had, out of the 250,000,000, at least 170,000,000 absolutely illiterate, 150 years after the commencement of British domination, and they had, as the noble lord had pointed out, a growing population, increasing by 2,000,000 a year, while the area of cultivation of food products was not making the same progress. What were the remedies put forward by the noble lord and the Government of India? Any number of expeditions to the Border. There had been 20 Border expeditions, involving the expenditure of a large amount of Indian money, during the last 20 years. Then there was to be a continuation of the railway policy of the Indian Government. He admitted that the building of railways in India was a necessary and beneficial work, but he contended that after they had carried out that policy to the extent they had, a better policy, one more required by the economic conditions of India, would be one which would sink more of India's own money in the carrying out of irrigation works, which experience had shown earned a very fair percentage of interest. He felt very strongly in sympathy with the Indian people. He felt the deepest sympathy with every people who were subject to another nation. He was one of those who believed that England had no right whatever to rule in any country outside her own borders—(ironical Ministerial cheers)—and he sincerely hoped and trusted that, unless the British Government would extend to British subjects in India the full right of protection of the British Constitution,

the Indian people would undertake by means fair and honourable to win their own independence. (Cheers.)

SIR CHARLES DILKE.

SIR C. DILKE said his hon. friends had spoken with such an evident amount of sympathy and with so strong a desire to grasp Indian grievances, that it was a matter of regret to him that they did not seem to have thoroughly thought out the proposals which they asked the House and the country to adopt. They ought to congratulate themselves on having, upon Indian questions, the Irish members in that House, because when they had to record, perhaps, an undue amount of optimism in all their British notions with regard to the success they had achieved in India, they certainly heard the other side from their Irish friends, who acted the part of the Devil's Advocate in their intention to canonise themselves. But he could not but think that the truth, as usual, lay very much between the two extremes. He regretted he could not give any support to the Motion, because its one definite suggestion—namely, the extension of the British Constitution, whatever that might be, to India—was one which did not in the least commend itself to his views. (Ministerial cheers.) At the same time, though there might be no risk of the adoption of this somewhat vague Resolution by that House, especially as it was composed now of a large number of gentlemen who gave special attention to Indian questions, it was wise that they should fairly and fully discuss it, because undoubtedly there were a great number of people outside the House who might be tempted to think that a panacea for the evils of India might be found in the adoption of the principles of the British Constitution. The fallacy which always underlay the speeches of those who desired violent and sudden remedies for the existing evils in India was that India was a single country to which any one plan or panacea could be applied. Not only was India vast in size, but the difference in the degree of civilisation, in the race and religion of the people, were so enormous, the discrepancies were so much greater than any which existed in any part of Europe and America, that almost any general system of dealing with those difficulties was necessarily absurd. It was almost impossible to propose with any confidence any general remedy for all those grievances. He agreed that the electorate of this country should recognise continually their enormous responsibility for the government of India, greater really than their responsibility for the government of this country, because as regarded this country interested persons, the taxpayers and ratepayers, had votes, and if their interests were seriously assailed they could revenge themselves by the use of those votes, whereas our Government of India, which was indirectly a Government formed by the House of Commons, was necessarily autocratic in its nature. Consequently it was necessary to touch the public conscience if they were to produce any effect at all. He did not agree that the electorate of this country were indifferent to Indian questions, quite the contrary; what they had to face was rather ignorance of facts than any desire on the part of the people to avert their eyes from these facts, and it was not easy to get busy people to inform them. Again, he did not agree that, having regard to all the circumstances, the present attendance of members of the House was not a good one. After all, the House of Commons was composed of hard-working and practical men, and the fact that all the figures were known in advance, that there were no secrets to disclose, that everybody had had the opportunity of reading the whole financial statement of India, naturally deprived this occasion of the interest it otherwise would have. No fair man, in his opinion, could attribute the distress or famine in any sense to British rule. He agreed that every excuse should be made for any violence of language in the native Press of Poona in recent times, and he was not at all hopeful that the Government would improve their position or make their rule more easy by any attempt to return to former Press legislation or by the interference with the liberty of the Press. On the other hand, he could not go with his hon. friends when they suggested that interference with the liberty of the Press in India was a matter which came home to the hearts and consciences of the people of India as a whole. The overwhelming majority of the population, leading their lives in cultivating the soil, were not concerned one way or other in these matters. In fact, the Press reached even indirectly but a wretchedly small portion of the population. Now the claim was made that popular control of the Indian Government

would do all sorts of things. Everything his hon. friend desired to do he claimed popular control would do. But he did not offer the smallest proof of the accuracy of his assertion. He claimed, for example, that popular control would put down the growth of the opium poppy in India; they might as well talk of putting down, by popular control, the growth of tobacco in Turkey or elsewhere. His hon. friend, in striking at some of the deficiencies in our rule in India, did not strike at some of the worst points, and he would make him a present of some of them—for example, the fact that, however good our Government might be at the top, it really came home to the people in the form of native police, who were often oppressive and corrupt. Now, there were undoubtedly great evils connected with our government of India, but we had to look at the tremendous difficulties presented by a country so enormous and so diverse a country, which had never been a single country, with no past traditions of rule, a country where we had to create, from the very beginning, the greatest portion of the machinery of organised government. His hon. friend seemed to think that it would be possible now—given what was best in our rule, given the state of things to which we had already come—to create a single India enjoying the principles of the British constitution. The process which had gone forward under our rule, the process of unification had undoubtedly gone far, but it was an infinite distance from having gone so far as to give any chance of forming a single India. He believed that if by the stress of war our rule in India had to be relaxed it could not be replaced by a single Government or by one capable of ruling the country as a whole. He sympathised with the observations of his hon. friend, the seconder of the motion, as to arbitrary arrest; but the arbitrary arrest of fifty or one hundred persons during the last few years, the detention of ex-royal personages under arbitrary arrest in India, whether approved or not, was a comparatively small matter in looking at the unhappiness of India, the economic condition of the country, and the difficulties of the Government, as compared with the larger question which the mover of the motion dealt with. The hon. member for South Mayo violently attacked this power of arbitrary arrest, and called it the introduction of the Bourbon principle of *lettre de cachet*. But this principle existed under the French Republic at the present time, though not in the same form. It was accompanied now by publicity and responsibility to the Elective Assembly, and here the Secretary of State for India could be censured both by the House of Commons and by the electorate of the country. It seemed to him that both the rulers of India, the autocracy of India, and the ultra-reformers who desired to upset the existing system, made a great mistake when they laid so much stress on uniform treatment, when they paid too little regard to the immense differences between part and part of India. Portions of India were prepared for governing themselves almost entirely, with a controlling hand from this country; but other parts of the country were still in the condition of the early Middle Ages, and were not capable of governing themselves. The Government of India had tried to bring the elective element into the government of the provinces. These provinces varied in size, their inhabitants professed different religions, they were hostile to one another; and this elective plan did not, to his mind, satisfy either of the conditions which were desired. It did not improve the government of the country, and it did not give any real control to the people. (Hear, hear.) A more hopeful experiment would be one which recognised the enormous difficulties between part and part of the country. In Mysore, for example, they had a small State administered under British control by men who had been largely trained in our schools. Mysore governed itself by elective institutions in all its purely domestic affairs, and in his opinion it was the best governed part of India. That was an example of the kind of decentralisation to which he looked forward more strongly every year as the best hope for the improvement of the government of India. In 1876 Mysore was face to face with a famine vastly more disastrous than the recent famine in India. A million of the inhabitants died, but in 1891 Mysore had made good all the deficiencies in her revenue and population. He did not believe, however, that they could apply the Mysore system to a province of 60,000,000 as one group, and still less that they could apply anything like it to India as a whole. We could afford to give the freest privileges of self-government to many parts of India where the interest of the people in their rule, where the amount of cultivation and civilisation

were sufficient to enable the people in all questions of domestic interest to rule themselves. There were other parts of India where representative institutions were inapplicable and calculated to produce ineffective government, while not giving the any real weight in the affairs of their province. He believed that the safe way in which to introduce natives and native opinion much more largely into the rule of the country was to decentralise in the direction of improving through our control and advice the government of the native States, gradually handing back even portions of the country, as in Mysore, to native rule. But we should remain responsible for all the larger affairs of State which affected India as a whole. (Hear, hear.)

COLONEL SANDYS.

Colonel SANDYS said that he would like to say a few words as one who spoke from personal knowledge of India. He had spent many years in the country, and he was intimately acquainted with the natives, had taken part in their administration, and spoke their language. It was a matter of astonishment to him that hon. members from Ireland, who were not, as a rule, well acquainted with India, should take a lead in the ventilation of this question. He had always understood, before he entered the House, that a member of Parliament generally spoke on a subject with which he was thoroughly acquainted—(laughter)—more or less at any rate. A great deal of licence had been allowed to the native Press in India. Though it was advisable that this freedom should be allowed, yet if the native Press were permitted to proceed beyond certain limits an enormous deal of harm might be done in the country, (Hear, hear.) There should be a power in India which had in its hands the means of restraining undesirable licence in the native Press, and from his knowledge of the natives he thought that the Indian Government and the Secretary of State had followed a wise line of policy. (Hear, hear.) As to the alleged *lettres de cachet*, he said that there were circumstances in India which rendered it necessary that justice should be prompt and should strike unfailingly. He reminded the Irish members that Mr. Gladstone imprisoned 1,100 men under a form of *lettre de cachet*, which was at that time acceptable to the House of Commons. There were certain parts of India where such a rule as existed in Mysore might be followed, but to introduce popular control as we understood it here would, if carried out universally or applied to any large extent, extinguish British rule in India. They were dealing with a race of people who had been living for centuries under a military despotism of a crushing nature; and to prematurely introduce the privileges and the constitution of this country in the government of India would be a most dangerous experiment. He remembered hearing Prince Bismarck's secretary say, after seven years' investigation for the purpose of reporting to the German Government upon the British rule in Hindostan, that "the English administration of India was the finest thing the world had ever seen." If he might venture to give the House any advice, he would quote the Duke of Argyll's expression, that "India was not gained by speeches in Parliament," and he would add this, "but it might be lost by them." It was dangerous for the House of Commons to interfere much in the Government of India. The wisest thing that could be done, both for the people of India and for this country, was to leave India as much as possible to the Secretary of State, the Governor-General, and the Councils. (Cheers.)

MR. JOHN DILLON.

Mr. JOHN DILLON said the hon. and gallant gentleman who had just sat down seemed to consider that it was not for Irish members to dare to address the House on Indian affairs, and he went on to lay down the principle that only those members who thoroughly understood the subject ought to speak in the House of Commons upon it. Well if that principle were observed in regard to Ireland—(hear, hear, and laughter from the Irish Benches)—they might push the principle a little farther, and say that only those who thoroughly understood that country should be sent over to govern that country, and then the House of Commons would be saved a great deal of trouble in Ireland. He would ask the hon. and gallant gentleman, before he lectured the Irish members, to endeavour to impress his principles upon his own party. It struck him as a singular instance of the self-righteousness and self-appreciation which were the characteristics of the

great race to which he belonged, that he seemed to assume that Irishmen were unfit, as a matter of course, to address the House on Indian affairs or to deal with Indian affairs in any way. It was rather a striking and singular commentary on his speech that the one name mentioned by the Secretary of State in commendation and laudation of the marvellous success of his administration in face of the famine and plague was an Irishman of his (Mr. Dillon's) own constituency. (Cheers.) This man would not, of course, be allowed to take any part in conducting the affairs of his own country, though he had shown himself so thoroughly capable of dealing with Indian affairs, and he had proved, at any rate, that if the hon. member for East Mayo was unfit to speak on Indian subjects, some of the people who had been inhabitants of East Mayo were qualified to manage Indian affairs with the special approval of the Secretary of State. (Cheers.) The fact was that "a fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind." If Irish members had no knowledge of Indian affairs except what they obtained from books and newspapers, they had some knowledge of English administration in Ireland; and when they heard claims made in that House such as were made by the hon. and gallant member, that they should leave Indian affairs to the officials, and not attempt to criticise them, on the plea that the less said in the House of Commons about India the better, he replied that they had experience of these matters, they knew something of an irresponsible administration, because they had lived under it, and therefore their minds were more open to appreciate and understand the grievances of these poor people in India than were the minds of most English members. He remembered saying once that the man who was going to send another person to gaol ought to have a little experience of gaol himself. (Laughter.) If they were going to enter into the grievances of people who were suffering under an irresponsible administration, they would be far more able to appreciate the feelings of these people if they were suffering such things themselves. The hon. and gallant member referring to the case of the brothers Natu—who were now suffering from the exercise of the odious and detestable power of imprisonment without charge made against them—said in proof of the necessity for their arrest that even here the Government had been obliged to apply that power to Irish members, and therefore it must be a good thing in India. That was one reason why, perhaps, they took such an interest in these men, because they had known what it was to lie in prison for twelve months without trial; and, therefore, as he had no shame in confessing, he felt all the more keen sympathy with these men, because he knew the fierce feelings of anger that entered into a man's breast when he was seized and dragged from his home without warrant and without cause stated, at the will of an irresponsible minister, and was denied the birthright of every Englishman—namely, the right of *habeas corpus*, and the right to be heard and tried by his fellow-men. (Cheers.) These were the very reasons that made Irishmen sympathetic, and take an interest in the oppressions of the Indian people. When listening to the lecture of the hon. and gallant member he was reminded throughout the speech of the fact that in some of the parts of India that were best governed and where the feelings and prejudices of the people were most taken into account, it was due to Irishmen—countrymen of his own—who had come from a country where he had seen the sufferings of an oppressed agricultural population, and by that experience knew better how to sympathise with the suffering people of Bengal and other parts of India, and had made themselves the champions—to their honour be it said—of these poor people. He could name a whole string of Irishmen who had earned the blessings and the gratitude of the people of India, and finally the approval of the British Government. (Cheers.) These were facts and considerations which hon. members opposite ought to admit entitled the Irish members of that House to speak, even although their knowledge might not be as full as that of hon. gentlemen on the other side, entitled them to raise their voices for the people of India when others would not; and feeble though their efforts might be, and small their numbers, do something to bring the light of day to bear on the action of the Indian Government, and to protect the people of India from oppression. (Cheers.) He wanted to say a word as to the case of the brothers Natu. He had made no charge whatever in connection with this matter. He had listened with pained interest to all that took place in the

House of Commons, and to the statements made in answer to questions, but he had made no charge. It might be quite true, as the Secretary of State for India had said, that there was no ground for the specific charges made against British soldiers of having committed outrages in Poona. He admitted that he was slow to believe in the charges against these men, for he knew that many of them were his own countrymen—of deliberate violence. But he did say, putting aside all these charges, and accepting the statement of the Secretary of State for India that no charge of misconduct or violence had been substantiated—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! This does not arise on the amendment. It may arise on the general question, but not on the amendment.

Mr. DILLON said he would pass away altogether on that subject. He was desirous of saying a word on the imprisonment of the brothers Natu. These men were taken—he did not know what charge was made against them; he had not seen it stated in the newspapers, except that they had been seized upon as dangerous people. But he understood that they were Hindu Brahmans of high caste. They all knew something of what caste in India meant; but he must confess that he was not aware of the great pride of caste, and the excitement which the arrest of these men had caused among the people of Poona, until he had the privilege of entertaining two of them at lunch the other day, when he heard a great deal about this matter. These men, as he had said, were of high caste; and it required very little knowledge of India to know that a man of the highest caste, if they forcibly destroyed his caste or made him do anything in contravention of his caste, he would a great deal rather his life were taken. He understood that one of the brothers Natu was taken to the segregation camp; and he would ask the Secretary of State for India if he would tell them what precautions were taken, if any precautions were taken, to protect the caste of this man when in the general segregation camp. He contended that if it were necessary—though he could not believe there was any necessity for taking a man of high caste and putting him in a segregation camp under general regulations—but if the necessity existed, the greatest possible precaution ought to have been taken to protect his caste, and not to subject him to unnecessary humiliations and to what he would feel to be a degradation. They were entitled to know what was done—because something must have been done—to give rise to the exasperation which existed in Poona amongst the friends and relations of these brothers Natu. (Hear, hear.) Another man who has been arrested, Mr. Tilak, was at the time, and still remained, a member of the Legislative Council; and he was allowed, as he understood, to become a member of the Council after the articles that were now supposed to incriminate him were written. On what ground had he then been arrested? This gentleman was brought to Bombay, the object being to strike terror in the mind of the natives.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: He was not brought to Bombay; he was already there. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. DILLON said that that fact was not in the least material to his argument. (Derisive cheers.) Mr. Tilak was twice brought before the Courts and bail was refused. Then he was brought up a third time and bail was granted. According to the *Times* correspondent the Court was crowded with natives, who cheered enthusiastically and drew the liberated man through the streets in triumph. Did the Indian Government hope to strike terror by provoking such scenes? Was the position of affairs improved by prosecuting this man? There were certain principles of personal liberty which whether they were violated in Bombay or in Ireland, every one could understand. It was right for Irish members—if no one else would do it—to rise in the House of Commons and speak on behalf of these principles and protest against these high-handed acts. In this particular matter he believed that Irishmen expressed the views of a large section of the people of both countries. If the British Government in India could not win the assent and approval of the people it had no right to exist. The motion of his hon. friend meant that the future stability of the British Government in India was to be sought in the extension to the people of India, not the whole machinery of the House of Commons, but those principles of even-handed justice, individual liberty, fair play to the poor, and responsible government in some shape, which were recognised as the principles of constitutional government in this country. (Hear, hear.)

LORD G. HAMILTON'S REPLY.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, who was imperfectly heard, was understood to say that no discussion of Indian affairs could take place without it being necessary to impress upon everyone the admonition of the right hon. member for the Forest of Dean. There were 250 millions of people in India, but they were not homogeneous. They were rather a mosaic of sects and races. Hon. members from Ireland had praised the rule in some of the native States. (Nationalist cries of "No!") With very few exceptions, there was not one native State in which the ruling class were not in an enormous minority. (Cheers.) If constitutional principles were introduced the present ruling class would be at once deposed. The hon. member for East Mayo had said that if the population of India was 250 millions of Irishmen England could not govern them. He quite agreed with the hon. member. (Laughter.) The 250 millions of Irishmen would set to work and conquer the world—(cheers and laughter)—such faith had he in the race to which he belonged—and when they had nobody else to fight then the real row would begin. (Laughter and cheers.) No one contended that our rule in India was perfect. There were obvious difficulties in governing a country of such enormous extent from a little island separated from it by thousands of miles. It was most unfair to test the system of government in India by that which existed in this country. The real test was the government which preceded British government, the government which would succeed it. (Cheers.) If the true principle of the British constitution was to develop individual liberty and to give everyone as much liberty as possible, British rule in India had accomplished that result to a most remarkable extent. (Cheers.) But, after all the object of all Governments, and notably of the British Government, was to give liberty of action and freedom of expression as far as was consistent with the safety of the community. (Hear, hear.) That was the governing consideration. We were a phlegmatic race compared with many of the nations of Europe, and we could permit in this country a freedom of action which would not be safe in other countries. Every Government in the world—whether it were the democratic Republic of the United States, or the Republic of France, or one of the autocratic monarchies of Europe—must have a reserve of power for times of emergency. All Governments obtained additional powers when they had to deal with exceptional difficulties, either by the temporary suspension of constitutional rights or by special legislation. But, as a rule, the difficulties with which they had to deal were so gradual that they afford time to obtain the powers in a leisurely way. But in India the religious and political atmosphere was charged with electricity. (Cheers.) The liberties of the British Constitution did not apply, for instance, to criminal lunatics; and in India, almost without warning, an apparently peaceful population might suddenly become as dangerous as criminal lunatics, with but one object before them—to murder the class alien to them. As every one knew, Madras was one of the most peaceful part in India. But from time to time there were outbreaks among the law-abiding people. A sudden fit seized them, and a number of quite young men, perhaps, would band themselves together to murder all who were not of their sect; and when troops were sent against them they killed as many of the troops as they could, and then got killed themselves. In this country we had special legislation to deal with dynamiters. But no explosive ever conceived by modern science was half so dangerous as the religious and political fanaticism in India. Therefore the Government of India could not have recourse only to the usages and methods of Western Governments. They must have a special power behind them, to be used from time to time. Every Government which had to deal with an Oriental population must have this power behind it; and the great distinction between the British Government in India and every other Eastern Government—with the exception, perhaps, of Japan—was that while with them despotic methods were the rule, the British Government had recourse to them but rarely. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member who spoke first on this question never once alluded to the two foul murders which had been perpetrated in Poona. (Hear, hear.) The Secondor of the Motion did; and, although he thought that the hon. gentleman held dangerous doctrines, he noticed that he denounced murder and outrage. It was not the first occasion on which the hon. gentleman had done so. Let the House consider for a moment what was the position of the Bombay

Government. They had exceptional difficulties to deal with, and they had to stamp out the plague. Two officers were murdered, and both the hon. members for Mayo insinuated that, although nothing was proved, it was not unlikely that something had occurred to provoke the murders.

Mr. DILLON? I made no insinuation against the soldiers. I said it was extremely likely that they had been offensive to the religious susceptibilities of the people. I should be very sorry to insinuate, without clear proof, that they had committed any outrage.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON pointed out that the insinuation remained. The charges adumbrated by the hon. member for South Mayo against British soldiers were absolutely without foundation. (Hear, hear.) He had seen letters from nurses who were in attendance on patients, and from officers, and in all these communications there were expressions of admiration with regard to the extraordinary patience and good behaviour of the soldiers. The representatives of the German and Russian Governments on the spot used similar language, stating that the manner in which houses were searched set an example which other nations similarly situated would do well to follow. (Hear, hear.) But what happened? A certain knot of persons in Poona set themselves to malign Mr. Rand and his coadjutors. The murders were perpetrated, and they were cold-blooded murders, carefully thought out and deliberately planned. They were not the deeds of a fanatic smarting under some sense of supposed wrong—under a belief, for example, that some outrage had been done to his family. Everybody, he thought, would admit that the persons who committed these crimes ought to be brought to justice. He believed that if anyone of the members from Ireland who had spoken, had been in the position of the Governor of Bombay he would have acted in the same way, and would have relegated the British Constitution to the place to which it properly belonged—(laughter)—he meant to that House. (Laughter and hear, hear.) The two native gentlemen who had been arrested were notorious men, and this was not the first time that they had been brought before the notice of the public. He believed that the authorities at Bombay were within their rights in the action which they had taken, and that the result the proceedings would be to unravel the plot that had been formed. The hon. member for East Mayo had enunciated principles absolutely antagonistic to the elementary doctrines of the British Constitution. The hon. member argued that it was a great mistake to have set the law in motion, because when bail was granted, the individual who was arrested was acclaimed and taken away in triumph by the mob. Did the hon. member seriously maintain that a man who was thought to be concerned in a crime ought not to be brought before a Court of law because he was popular? The principle of the British Constitution was that the law was no respecter of persons, and he believed that one reason why this dead set was made against Mr. Rand was, because in the just discharge of his duties he drew no distinction between rich and poor. (Hear, hear.) Hon. members opposite said that the brothers Natu were men of high caste, and that every consideration ought to be shown for caste. With that he agreed. We ought to show the utmost regard for the religious usages and customs of a country whose civilisation was far older than our own. But he believed that nothing was done in the segregation camp which could affect Mr. Natu's caste. What occurred was this. There was a death in the house of one of the brothers Natu. It was reported to the Commissioner, and the body of the child that had died from the plague was found in the garden of one of the brothers. He told the Commissioner that it was the child of one of his servants. The story being believed he was not sent to the segregation camp, but it was subsequently found that the story was untrue, and that the child was the child of one of the brothers, who had buried it in the garden. The law was then carried out.

Mr. DAVITT asked what steps were taken in the segregation camp to observe the caste of the brothers?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON could not say, but probably there were persons of quite as high a caste as the brothers Natu in the segregation camp, and he had never heard that a person's treatment in a segregation camp resulted in his losing caste. It was pertinent to remember, in discussing this matter, that a number of native gentlemen were acting on the plague committees. Almost all the complaints which had been made had been found, after investigation, to have been concocted in

Poona. In fact, there had been a most deliberate conspiracy in Poona—not the first of its kind—to disseminate through the press false information, which had even impressed hon. members in that House. He thought he had been able to show that the stories thus circulated were a tissue of fabrications. (Hear, hear.) He agreed that the Government ought to be very chary of using the power which had been used in this case, but on this occasion it had been exercised legitimately. (Hear, hear.) Pending the trials which were to take place, he could not make a fuller statement, but next Session hon. members would be able to raise the question again, and he believed he would be in a position to satisfy them that what had been done was right.

Mr. MACNEILL asked leave to withdraw his Amendment, but leave was withheld.

The House divided on Mr. MacNeill's Amendment, when the figures were:—

For the Amendment	17
Against	97
Majority against				80

SIR W. WEDDERBURN.

On the return of the SPEAKER, after the usual interval, and an ineffectual attempt to count out the House,

SIR W. WEDDERBURN said that this was the one appointed opportunity in the year for discussing the general affairs of India, and he much regretted that it had been fixed for a date when the House was practically broken up, and also that it had fallen at a time of some anxiety in India in several directions, so that it was difficult to discuss affairs as freely as was desirable on account of the fear of in any way embarrassing the Government. He referred especially to events at Malakand, regarding which much might be said, and perhaps ought to be said. He felt it however his duty to say a few words upon what after all was the great central question for India, as well as for all other countries; he meant the condition of the masses. All other matters, however important they might appear, were by comparison accidental and transitory. But upon the condition of the masses depended the success and safety of our rule. There was a pathetic proverb in India which said that the worst form of rebellion was the rebellion of the belly. And he besought the people of this country not to lose sight of this central point of the whole situation. If the masses were contented and prosperous, all would be well. Now in India, in speaking of the masses, they meant the rayats or peasant cultivators who, with their belongings, comprised some 80 per cent. of the whole population. They lived grouped together in rural village communities, of which there were about half a million in the whole of India. And his contention had always been that the way to get at the truth regarding the rayat's past history, his present condition, and future prospects, was to make a careful and detailed village enquiry, learning from each individual rayat his experiences, and what were his complaints, and what form of relief he most required. Unhappily they had reason to believe that the rayats as a class were in a condition of deep destitution. Had they possessed a reasonable store of food, of money, or of credit, they would have been able to tide over at least one failure of harvest. But the experience of the famine showed that they were not able to do this. As a rule they not only possessed nothing, but much less than nothing—being hopelessly indebted to the money-lenders. He therefore last January, as an amendment to the Address, had pressed the noble lord the Secretary of State for India to grant a village enquiry of this kind by local representative Committees, in the several provinces; pointing out that this did not involve a Commission from England, or any disturbance of famine work, and that the cost would be quite nominal. The noble lord had not shown himself altogether averse to enquiry. He had been so good as to say that he (Sir William) had advanced some practical suggestions, and even that (with certain qualifications) he had made a sensible speech. As regards the proposed enquiry the Secretary of State had said that he agreed that the opportunity of the famine ought not to be allowed to pass without taking every opportunity to enquire into and ascertain the best methods of protecting the people of India

from the recurrence of similar calamities. This sounded hopeful. But he (Sir William) feared that the enquiries contemplated by the noble lord were purely official enquiries in the ordinary departmental routine, and from such investigations drastic reforms such as were required could hardly be expected. The fact was, the existing official system was chiefly to blame for the rayat's difficulties. Upon this point he offered himself as a witness, as he had made the rayat his special study for the last 30 years and more. He also thought he was an impartial witness, for he began his enquiries with all the prepossession in favour of the official system natural to a member of the Civil Service. But he gradually and reluctantly came to the conclusion that a great portion of the land revenue system, though good in theory and well intentioned, was not suited to the condition of the rayat. In now renewing, therefore, his proposals for enquiry, he had sent to every member of the House a statement showing the facts and figures upon which his conclusions were based. The conclusions were that there were three main causes of the rayat's distress: (1) The excessive revenue demand. The orders of the Home Government were that the revenue demand should not be a rack-rent, but should leave with the cultivator the wages of labour, the interest on capital, and half the true rent. But it was officially admitted that compliance with this instruction was practically unknown in India; the Government demand trenched upon interest on capital and wages of labour; nevertheless in spite of this admission the Government demand was being continually enhanced, up to 100 per cent. in some villages, and even 1,000 per cent. in certain individual holdings. The second main cause of the rayat's distress was (ii) the harsh and rigid mode of collection, which exacted punctual payment of a fixed annual cash assessment, thus placing upon the rayat the burden of uncertain seasons, a burden he was not able to bear, so that he was driven to the money-lender; and the third cause was (iii) the establishment of debt courts on the European model, which had armed the money-lender with all the power of the Empire, and enabled him to reduce the rayat to the lowest depth of serfdom. These facts were all painfully familiar to the rayats, and were well known throughout India. But unfortunately they were not known to the House or to the British public. The troubles thus produced were capable of a remedy, and in each case he had indicated the direction in which the remedy should be sought, by a cautious return to the old native custom. Further, he had matured a scheme for rescuing the rayat from the toils of the money-lender by means of Agricultural Banks. This scheme had received general approval, and was cordially supported by the Viceroy of India in Council. But it was vetoed by the India Office. He would not weary the House by going more into details, but he would claim that he had established a case for an enquiry on the lines asked for in the amendment. From his personal experience he firmly believed that by this simple and easy method much might be done to improve the condition of the masses, thereby spreading contentment throughout the land. (Hear, hear.) He desired to add a few words regarding the present situation in India and the proposal contained in the first part of the amendment. At the last great famine, 20 years ago, the mortality was estimated by the Famine Commissioners at 5½ millions. They had no means of knowing what the mortality was in the present famine. But the area affected was greater than on the former occasion, and in spite of the praiseworthy and well-organised efforts on the part of the Government, the suffering and death must be very great, and must continue for several months more, even if favourable rains produced a crop which could be reaped in October. In addition to the famine had come the plague, and in some parts the earthquake, so that men's minds were nearly distracted, their hearts failing them from fear. Under these circumstances he felt sure that the House would gladly send them a kindly message of sympathy. Especially such an expression of sympathy seemed called for when they contrasted the exuberant prosperity of this country with the present unhappy condition of the masses in India. And further he would most earnestly deprecate any unnecessary measures of severity towards the people of India in any shape or form. The wise doctor was very forgiving to a suffering patient. His gentleness would not be mistaken for weakness. He would not be angry for anything the sufferer did in the paroxysm of his fever. On the contrary, he would only redouble his efforts to remove the cause of his delirium. Similarly he (Sir William) would appeal to the noble lord the

Secretary of State for India to be very merciful towards the Indian people, who were sick almost unto death. The noble lord had spoken the other day of an iron hand in a velvet glove. But under the existing grievous circumstances the hand should not be of iron. What was needed was not an iron hand but a human hand, strong and kindly, ready to help the weak and raise those that were fallen. As regarded events at Poona, he thought the matter had been exaggerated. He believed that it would be found that the assassinations were isolated crimes unconnected with any widespread conspiracy. Doubtless there were everywhere in India certain elements of danger, but there were greater elements of safety. The party of constitutional reform known as the Indian National Congress made it its business to meet the dangers and assuage them, as far as it could, by having everything open so as to avoid secret conspiracy, to mitigate race hatreds, and to see that all respected the religion of others. The Congress party had three great principles. The first was that all its actions should be based on the stability and prosperity of British rule; the second that all its methods should be open and above board; and the third that its action should be strictly constitutional and law-abiding. If any movement was not in accordance with these three great principles, the Congress would have nothing to say to it. The Congress had two main objects—to prevent secret conspiracies, and to bring every grievance to the notice of the Government, also respectfully to make representations to the Government for the redress of grievances, because it believed that by the redress of grievances the people would be rendered both prosperous and contented, and this was the only way to make the British Government strong and based on a good foundation. There were two elements of safety—the principal one that the great body of the people, especially the educated classes, believed that it was only under the stability of the British Government that any happy future for India was possible. He feared very much that measures might be taken from want of thorough appreciation of the situation and sympathy with these poor suffering people who, he was willing to admit, might in their frenzy do things they might afterwards be sorry for. If the police were not trustworthy it was dangerous to put them in authority over the people at large, and all oppressive measures were dangerous because they had to be carried out by an organisation not in itself trustworthy. If oppressive police measures were taken they would paralyse and alienate those who wished the British Government well, and would drive discontent inwards, and that was the way the powers of the party of violence were strengthened. (Hear, hear.) He earnestly warned the Secretary for India to be careful. No one could doubt that, as regarded the Poona affair, the great body of the people of India, especially the educated classes, regarded the assassinations with the utmost detestation and horror. The natives of India were a humane, gentle race, and in the vast country of India assassinations were quite unknown. Those who, like himself, had lived in India had felt more safe there than in London. In India they lived with doors and windows open. In India they were not afraid of burglars, and if a man wanted to send his wife and children across country he put them in charge of a native guard, and knew that they would be safe. The natives of India were a gentle, trustworthy, and humane race, and he could not understand why the Anglo-Indian press so constantly wrote against them and insulted them. What was there to be gained by making the natives unfriendly? The natives of India abominated odious crimes such as those that had taken place, as they were the chief sufferers by such crimes if the Government were driven to measures of severity. These crimes were hateful to them because they prevented the possibility of the peaceful, gradual, and constitutional reforms on which their hearts were set, and which they regarded as necessary for the future welfare of the country. He therefore trusted the Secretary for India would hold the balance steadily, maintain a judicial position, and not be the apologist of the India Office or the Executive, but as the representative of her Majesty hold the balance evenly and hear the weaker side. The official class in India had all the power in their hands. It was the people who were weak, and they looked to the Secretary for India to be their protector. Let him give them an impartial hearing, and treat them kindly and leniently. The wise course for the Indian Government to pursue was to preserve a firm but humane attitude, conciliating the goodwill of the great body of the people whose interests were identical with those of a just and

kindly Government. And in this connexion he might say that it was not even now too late to extend to India some boons in connexion with the Jubilee. (Hear, hear.) Such a gracious act would do much to calm down the unavoidable unrest produced by such an accumulation of misfortunes; whether such concessions took the form of a further expansion of the Legislative Councils, or a legislative limitation of the Government revenue demand, as an encouragement to the suffering cultivators. Confidence begat confidence. And what he desired was to see British rule recognised not as an alien domination but as the National Government, giving contentment to the masses, and free scope to the aspirations of those who hoped to raise India to a noble place among the nations of the world. (Cheers.)

MR. SAMUEL SMITH.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH said they had seldom approached an Indian Debate under such painful circumstances as this year. That great country was suffering from the horrors of the worst famine of this century, from a terrible plague, from a destructive earthquake, from frontier disturbances, and from widespread discontent. They had Jubilee rejoicings over the greatness and prosperity of the British Empire, but by far the largest province of that Empire had no heart to share in the rejoicings. He hoped they should discuss the question of India that night in an earnest and sympathetic spirit, and show their fellow-subjects there that they would do all they could to alleviate their sufferings. He was sorry to think that there could be no real alleviation of the famine till the next harvest was reached in October or November after the monsoon. The present condition of things was far worse than people in this country supposed. Some forty or fifty millions of people were suffering from acute famine, some thirty millions more from scarcity. The price of food in the famine districts was 200 per cent. above the usual rate; the bulk of the people had parted with all they possessed; the poor peasants had mostly lost their cattle, and had sold their agricultural implements, their silver ornaments, and cooking utensils, and had no means to carry on agriculture even after the famine was over. Multitudes of families had been broken up in going to the relief camps; in many cases the bread-winners had died, and left helpless women and children. The family system, which was the basis of Hindu life, was shattered in a large part of India, and they were face to face with a huge mass of disorganised and helpless humanity. From all he could gather, the loss of life had already been appalling, not only from direct starvation, but from the diseases that followed it. He noticed that last February the deaths in the distressed districts in the North-West and the Central Provinces were 26,000, against an average of 12,000 the preceding ten years; in some places the death rate was seven times the normal rate. He feared these figures would grow worse and worse till October, and when the final results were summed up, he much feared that the loss of life would run into millions. Among many letters that he had read from the famine districts, he would quote from one by a well-known Hindu lady, Pandita Ramabai, who, by great self-denial, had saved a large number of orphans from the Central Provinces. She described a visit to one of the Poor Houses or Relief Camps: "The first poorhouse we saw was no house at all. It was a grove in the outskirts of the town. Groups of famished people were seen sitting all round the grove. Some were lying down in heaps, or sitting or lying in ashes on the dirty ground. Some had rags to cover their bodies, and some had none. There were old and young men, and women and children, most of them ill, too weak to move about, and many suffering from leprosy and other unmentionable diseases. Bad men, immoral women, pure young girls, innocent children and old people, good, bad, and indifferent, were freely mixing and conversing with each other. They slept in the open air or under the trees at night, and ate the scanty and coarse food provided by the Government. The food was nothing but dry flour and some salt. An accustomed eye could at once see that the grain was adulterated with earth before it was ground into flour. There were several starving orphan children who could not cook for themselves, and had no one to work for them. So they had either to eat the dry flour or depend upon the tender mercies of their fellow-sufferers, the older persons, who took as much of their food as they could, with the right of their might. The poor people seem to have lost all human feeling. They

are most unkind towards each other and the little children around them. They do not care even for their own children. Some parents eat all the food they get for themselves and for their little ones, and become quite fat, while their children are starved and look like skeletons, and some are even in a dying state, and yet their fathers and mothers feel no affection for them. Parents can be seen taking their girl-children around the country and selling them for a rupee or a few annas, or even for a few seers of grain. The food given to the children is snatched from their hands, and eaten by their stronger neighbours. In some places the Government officials give two pices or more to each child, or old and sick persons unable to work; but what can a baby of two or three years of age do with two copper pices in its hands?" The House will note that she stated the food was adulterated with earth. This was the doing of the subordinate officers, such as the *mukadams* or cooks. She said: "Few of the subordinate officers, such as the *mukadams* (oversours) and cooks, who have it in their power to give or withhold from the poor the food sent for them, have any heart or conscience. The grain—the very cheapest kind—is bought and ground into flour without being cleaned of the sand and earth it contains. Then the heartless cooks steal the flour and put a quantity of earth into it, while they cook the *dal* and *roti*, and nobody notices that the food is thus adulterated. The poor people are too much afraid of the *mukadams* to complain to the higher officials. The flour and pulse so adulterated, when made into *rotis* and *dal*, do not look any better than cakes of cow-dung." Those Relief Camps were destructive to the morals of women and girls. She went on to say: "Young men can be seen everywhere talking to girls and women under the pretence of doing the *mukadam's* work. This is no good sign at all. Wicked men and women are everywhere on the look out for young women and girls. They entice them by offering sweetmeats and other kind of food, clothing, and fair promises to take them to nice places and make them happy. So hundreds of girls, young widows, and deserted wives, are waylaid as they go to the Relief Camps and poorhouses in search of food and work, and taken away before they place themselves in the custody of the Government." He need not say more to show the terrible disintegration of Indian society that was taking place. He did not blame the Anglo-Indian officials. They were doing the utmost they could; they were working beyond their strength, and many had died from exhaustion. In one district five civil servants had died; but no government could save 50 millions of famine-stricken people. His object in bringing these painful facts before the House was to show that they must dig deeper and try more drastic remedies, and, above all, abandon their habit of easy self-complacent optimism. It would be said the famine was the act of God, and how was Government responsible for this? He granted it; but India had periodical famines, and their true policy was to fight them by more copious irrigation works, and a better land system. The Indian Government had spent enormous sums on railways of late years, but comparatively little on irrigation works. The railways had done much good, but they did not grow food, and they did not prevent it going to a famine price in a year like this. Irrigation gave fine crops in the worst seasons. Then the railways as a whole had never paid their cost. They still cost the Government two or three crores a year, say two to three millions of tens of rupees. From the beginning of the system the loss on railways to the State had been 51 crores, including military railways, and protective railways against famine. Irrigation works had in several cases paid the capital expenditure several times over; in other cases they had been a financial failure, but their average dividend was about 5 per cent.; yet they had only spent one-tenth as much on irrigation works as upon railways. He quoted these figures from the excellent Memorandum recently addressed to the Secretary of State for India. The fact was, powerful British interests were constantly pressing the India Office to extend railways in India, as most of the material was bought in this country, but no pressure was put upon it to extend irrigation works, as the expenditure was all in India. It would be replied that Government can only construct such works on the line of the great river basins, such as the Ganges, the Jumna, the Godavery, etc., while most of the country is above the level of the river basins. This was true, and river and canal irrigation could not be extended to most of India; but irrigation by wells and tanks was possible over nearly all of India, and this work could be done by the

peasantry far better than by the Government. Our policy should be to encourage the peasantry by every means to do their own irrigation. They should have security of tenure, something in the nature of a permanent settlement on the soil to give them an interest in providing tanks and wells. To a peasant this was a serious piece of work; it meant the occupation of all his spare time for years, and, of course, he would not undertake it unless he knew he would reap the fruits of his labour. When he was in India, he was everywhere told this was one of the greatest of drawbacks, this want of security. It was simply the Irish question as it was before 1881. The noble lord said that suffering had been greater where there was permanent settlement, but could he name any district where the rayats had a permanent settlement? The zemindars in Bengal had a permanent settlement, but they were a large landed class, with thousands of small tenants and it was like giving a permanent settlement to the worst class of landlords in Ireland. The zemindars in Bengal were originally tax collectors. Lord Cornwallis unwisely gave them a fixed settlement, and they rack-rented their tenants terribly until the recent Act conferring occupancy rights on the rayats. It was strongly stated in India that our system of land assessment was a great discouragement to these small irrigation works. Most of the soil is re-assessed every thirty years, and the rayats are afraid to sink their capital from fear of exorbitant re-assessments, as the land is much more productive by irrigation. Some of the wisest of the Indian Viceroyes, like Lord Canning, were of opinion that there ought to be a permanent settlement of the Land Tax, so that the peasantry could feel entire security in improving their land, knowing that all the benefit would go to themselves. Lord Halifax accepted this view in his famous dispatch of 1862. He commended this great question to the attention of the Indian Government. But an even more urgent remedy was to rescue the Indian peasantry, who are 80 per cent. of the whole population of India, from the grasp of the money-lender. They were nearly all hopelessly in debt. India possessed village usurers of the type of Mr. Kirkwood by tens of thousands. The peasantry were often charged 5 per cent. per month. Our system of collecting the revenue by punctual cash payments, whatever the season or size of the crops, had thrown the farmer into the hands of the usurer. He quoted the opinion of the late Sir James Caird, one of the best agriculturists of this country, who was on the Famine Commission, which made one of the best reports on India he had ever met with. It was a perfect mine of information on all rural and social questions. Sir James Caird said: The right of the cultivator to mortgage the public land has made him the slave of the money-lender. Government rent must be paid on the day it becomes due. It is rigorously exacted by the officials, and as the money-lender is the only capitalist within reach the cultivator gives a charge on the land, and hands over all his crop as a security for cash advances. The old Indian Governments took a share of the crop, so in bad years the rayats had to pay little. We require prompt payment in all seasons, though revenue is sometimes remitted in bad famine years. Then we enable the usurer to collect his debts by distraint on the property of the peasant. He applies to the Small Debt Court, and gets a decree to sell him up just as Mr. Kirkwood and his kind in this free country sell up their wretched clients. In olden times in India a little village tribunal, called the Panchayet, of five village elders, arbitrated in such cases, and protected the ignorant peasant against Shylocks. This was impossible now with our elaborate judicial proceedings. What we needed in India was to go back to those more primitive customs which were far better suited to a primitive people. We in the present day, perfectly satisfied with our own system, sometimes made experiments on native races with lamentable results. No one understood this question better than his friend, Sir William Wedderburn; none more truly sympathised with the Indian peasant. He commended to the Indian Government his scheme of agricultural banks, which was most unwisely nipped in the bud by the India Office in former years. He had indicated the lines of a drastic land reform in India. The impoverishment of the peasantry was the tap root of all our difficulties in India; it was the cause of most of the disaffection which now existed. India would never be contented till the peasantry were more prosperous. He strongly recommended that an exhaustive enquiry should be made into the subject. The report of the last Famine Commission had had been forgotten, and had not been acted upon. He strongly

advised the re-issue of the recommendations of that Commission. But these reforms, even if adopted, would only bear fruit in the distant future; something more was needed to meet the present terrible distress. The Indian Government only undertook to give bare subsistence to the victims of famine. It could not do more, for it had to raise the cost from the poor taxpayers in India, yet we were told in the report of Mr. James, the Government Inspector, that, "40 lakhs are needed for seed alone in the North-West Provinces. The fact is, the dearth has been so widespread that contributions have been a mere drop in the ocean. When prices rise 50 per cent. over usual, all margin over mere capacity to sustain life is cut off. The amount of relief that could be given without including any but cases of real acute distress is practically limitless." The schemes of improvement I have submitted could not be carried out under many years. They dealt with the India of the future, and help was needed for the suffering masses of the people of India at present. Our country was prosperous, our colonies were prosperous; we were congratulating ourselves on the greatness of the Empire, but over our huge Indian possessions, containing the largest population, hung the greatest gloom and misery. Could we do nothing in this Jubilee year to alleviate this? He appealed to the Government and to the House to make a special grant to India in this time of awful need. Our income was overflowing; we should have another large surplus next year. What better use could we make of one or two millions than devoting such a sum to the alleviation of the misery in India. It would be the most worthy celebration of the Jubilee year. It would do more to appease discontent in India than any number of Press prosecutions. Parliament would approve of it, it would be popular in this country and he was sure it would be a wise thing to do politically. We were not a sentimental people; we were slow to recognise how great a part sentiment played in the government of the world. He was sure such an act would touch the heart of India and do more for the safety of our Empire than increased armaments. What they required was some fund which could be applied for the benefit of the peasantry after the famine was over so as to give them a fresh start. He thought £2,000,000 could be so applied as to confer immense benefits upon India, and that it would touch the hearts of the people of that country as nothing else had done. He believed that, in certain circumstances, measures of repression might be necessary, but a far wiser policy would be a generous act of this kind, which would have a marvellous effect. He appealed to the House to signalise this year by a great act of mercy to India, and he hoped the Government would consider his suggestion and not hastily commit themselves against it. In his view, great perils lay before them in India, and they should anticipate them in a wise and statesmanlike way.

SIR M. M. BROWNAGGREE.

SIR M. BROWNAGGREE thought it both his duty and privilege on that the first occasion on which he had had the opportunity of addressing the House on an Indian subject since the terrible atrocities that had occurred in India to express the horror, the indignation, and the humiliation felt by the loyal millions of that country at the dastardly crimes with which the efforts of the Government to arrest the plague had been rewarded. (Hear, hear.) He spoke with a great sense of responsibility in the matter, but he was perfectly sure that, in saying what he had, he spoke in the name and on behalf of the millions upon millions of people in India, who felt the humiliation and the degradation of the act which had been committed, because they realised and were always ready to acknowledge, the manifold blessings of peace and progress which had been carried to them by British rule. (Cheers.) The hon. member who moved the motion declared that he had resolved from henceforth to proclaim to the constituencies of the United Kingdom that they did not realise what responsibility lay upon their shoulders with respect to the 300 millions of people in India whom they governed, and that he was going to try his best to arouse them to a sense of that responsibility. He congratulated him upon that sentiment, but when he saw just 17 hon. members on the benches opposite, he confessed he had not much faith in the hon. member for Donegal's chances of success. Moreover, it was worth while remembering that those who had taken Indian matters under their benevolent control had decided, in their wisdom, only to ask members on the Opposition side of the House to take part in their deliberations. There was a

Parliamentary Indian Committee, consisting of 140 or 150 members on the Radical side, but how many of the 150 were present that night when the affairs of India were being considered by the House? He presented it to the consideration of hon. members whether it was not a misrepresentation to give it out to the Indian public that the members of this House on the Ministerial Benches did not care for India, and that the only ones who did care sat on the opposite side. He could afford to treat the remarks levelled at him personally by two or three members opposite earlier in the debate either with amused indifference or contempt. He would acquit them of having any personal feeling in the matter, under the assurance they had given that they were not acquainted with the country they talked about. He remembered a question repeatedly asked on the other side whether it was a fact that the casts of the Natus had been broken by one of them being taken to the plague hospital. He believed that on this point they were misled by the information given to the hon. member for Mayo by two gentlemen from India of a Hindu caste, whom he informed us he had invited to lunch in this House.

MR. DILLON: I asked the noble lord, the Secretary of State, whether that statement was a fact? I saw the statement in the *Times* newspaper.

SIR M. BROWNAGGREE: By whosoever that information was conveyed, the question betrayed gross ignorance of the caste system of India. There had appeared before them the precious Mr. Gokhale, who had, under the guidance of the hon. member for Banff, defiled the threshold of this glorious building (Laughter.) The Natus, he knew to his certain knowledge, belonged, like Mr. Gokhale, to a section of people, who were called reformers, whose endeavours in the line of social reform were perfectly laudable. They were hampered by a great many hardships of which hon. members could have no possible conception. They were afflicted by a system of child marriages, and the prevention of widows' marriages, and a great many other customs from which the reformers tried to free themselves by relaxing the bonds of caste. The Natus had consequently no rigorous caste observances to keep. It happened that one of them was taken to the plague hospital, which irritated these men, who were very powerful, because, as the hon. member for Mayo said, they were very rich, and one of them being called upon to subject himself to the rules and regulations laid down for the arrest of the plague, had led them to behave in a manner which had caused a suspicion of their being implicated in certain serious operations. That was the explanation of the importance attached to the caste question by hon. members opposite. With respect to the arrest of these Natus, the hon. member was in error as to the Regulation that was acted upon; it was the Act of 1897 which empowered the Government of Bombay to take action, in consonance with the provisions of law, which had been acted upon, and not the Regulation of 1817 as was mistakenly supposed. Dealing with certain references which had been made to himself, he said that when, on the inspection of certain native newspapers, he found an astonishing report of the proceedings of a meeting in Poona, he felt it to be his duty, as a member of the House, as a lover of India—(cheers)—and as a loyal subject of Her Majesty—(cheers)—to ask whether the local officials, who did not know the vernacular, were aware that such seditious utterances had been made before large gatherings of students and ignorant men. That had been the extent of his crime. He had been charged with being disloyal to the interests of India, but he pointed out that the men whose cause was being advocated by hon. members opposite were not the men of whom the people of India were proud. (Cheers.) Not a man of them represented the public feeling of India, in spite of the assertion of the hon. member for Banffshire to the contrary. Those whom the hon. baronet was strangely befriending were only a few hundred, or at most a few thousand, men out of the myriad population of India; and it was his duty both as an advocate of the true interests of India and as a loyal citizen of the British empire to do all he could, even at the risk of personal sacrifice, to expose those currents of sedition which were making havoc of the future prosperity and safety of our Indian empire. (Cheers.) Large masses of natives themselves and many native editors cried down this seditious teaching, and called loudly for the enforcement of measures to prevent it in future. He had numerous letters and extracts to prove this, but would content himself with reading a short extract from a letter which he had just received from one who had been chairman of the Municipal Corporation

of Bombay. "Here," said the writer, referring to the Poona murders, "is another sad example of the loyalty and devotion of the Congress Brahmins of Poona. A very sad tragedy was enacted by some dastardly and cowardly fellows soon after twelve midnight, after all had enjoyed the jubilee celebrations to their hearts' content." Turning to the Irish members, he suggested they should confine their attention either to Ireland or India. They could not look after both. If they choose to look after India, what would be Ireland's gain would be India's loss. (Cheers.) He might next mention one or two events to show hon. members that the people of India had much reason to be grateful for the blessings conferred on them in the last sixty years, and to rejoice on the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee. In 1837 was settled a big struggle which fixed the fate of India to a large extent with regard to its future development. A controversy had been raging between the Orientalists and the Occidentalists to determine whether the system of education in India should be established on the basis of a Western education or a purely Oriental education. That long controversy, conducted with great ability, was settled in the year 1837, by its being decided that in future the education of India should proceed on Western lines. (Hear, hear.) He thought it was in the same year that the cruel system of suttee, under which widows were burnt on the funeral pyre, was abolished under the influence, and owing to the influence of, British rule. (Cheers.) In a few years more slavery was abolished from India. In 1837, as now, plague and pestilence had taken hold of certain portions of the land; but the distress inflicted on the country by these calamities was not met in the effectual manner in which it had been met to-day. (Hear, hear.) There were a few events among many others which would convince anybody that India was justified in rejoicing, as she did rejoice, in the celebration of the sixtieth anniversary of Her Majesty's coronation. (Cheers.) The lucid explanation which the noble lord had given in regard to the accounts of the past year, and the Budget for this year, invited comment, but he could not at that time of the night venture to take the House into details. All he should content himself with doing was to express his satisfaction at the fact that, while the country had passed through the throes of such dire calamities, her pecuniary credit and fiscal arrangements had not been submitted to any great convulsion. The best gauge of that was the good position which the Government loans maintained both in this country and in India. (Hear, hear.) He thought that with regard to the railway estimates which the noble lord had put before the House, one might express great satisfaction, because it had been proved that railways, after all, had been the best agencies in arresting the ravages, not only of famine, but even of plague, because without the railways the people could not have been transported from one centre to another, which was necessary to be done in order to take them away from the plague-stricken districts, and he, therefore, had to express his satisfaction at learning that the railway programme of the Government of India was not to be disturbed. He had, however, one complaint to make, and it was this, that Bombay had been badly treated in the distribution of grants, because the Government of India had not apportioned to Bombay the fair share of the railway works which it needed. One or two main schemes which might have connected Bombay with Upper India without break of gauge had been put off for a long time. He trusted, however, that the noble lord, on reconsideration, would see his way to making such amendments as would furnish Bombay with those resources in the shape of lines of communication by railway which she sorely needed, and the want of which, he believed, had been represented to him through the Bombay Government and the Government of India. The feeder lines which might be legitimately encouraged, as native capital was available for them, and their success was no longer a matter of doubt after the profitable working of the Ahmedabad Prantaj line. Before passing to a much-debated question, he thought he was entitled to say a word with regard to the question of irrigation, which had been started by previous speakers. He expressed his deep sympathy with the idea of carrying on a large system of canals for one main reason, and that was this, that the most of the outlay on whatever labour they bestowed upon the construction of canals, and whatever implements were used in their construction, would come back to the people of India, and not much of it would go abroad. At the same time, although he was in perfect sympathy with the motives which had prompted the arguments so ably put by the hon.

member opposite, he would, perhaps, be glad to hear a very competent opinion with regard to the difficulty of proceeding with irrigation works, and the authority to whom he referred was an able native gentleman who had been engaged in the work of administration for a great many years, and who could not be accused of any partiality for the building of railways as a means of putting money into the pockets of English or European manufacturers. His opinion was this, that while canals, where successful, were more efficacious as tending to prevent the recurrence of famine by multiplying the area of cultivation, nevertheless, there were difficulties in the way of irrigation only too well known locally, and, in fact, the construction of useful canals in by far the greater portion of India was impossible. He mentioned this fact to show that if the suggestions of hon. members were not accepted by the responsible authorities who had to conduct the administration of India, it must not be put down to want of sympathy, but rather to a more critical knowledge of the subject than hon. members themselves possessed. There was another matter on which he should like to dwell with some emphasis—namely, the treatment of British Indian subjects in the South African colonies.

THE SPEAKER: Order, order! This does not arise on the question before the House. It is a South African, not an Indian question.

SIR M. BHOWMAGERRIE said he would defer what he wished to say on the subject to a more favourable occasion, and proceeded to quote testimony of an eminent Hindu gentleman to the efficacy of the measures adopted by the Government of India to meet the ravages of famine. As to the feeling of the Muhammadans, he had in his hand a printed letter from a Muhammadan, referring to recent speeches by some socialist speakers and by Mr. Naoroji, and declaring that they would be treasonable if they were not absurd, and expressing the hope that the English people would not sympathise with such wind and bluster. With the exception of a few obstinate and perverse minds—(cheers)—it was patent by this time to the world that the measures adopted by the supreme Government and the subordinate Governments of India to arrest the ravages of the famine had been most efficacious, and had successfully combated a disaster in such a complete manner as had never before been experienced in the history of India. (Cheers.) As to the plague operations, they had heard till they were sick of a Hindu gentleman, a Professor of a private Poona College, who had, in the words of the hon. member for Banffshire, become a patriot by devoting 20 years of his life to the work of education at a very small salary. This Mr. Gokhale was brought over to give evidence before the Royal Commission on the grievances of India, and he was asked to say what he knew about the plague operations in Poona. The hon. member for Banffshire had apologised to the House for his grave mistake in that connexion, and he should pass the incident by if the apology had been at all commensurate with the vast mischief for which he had been responsible. (Cheers.) The hon. member had been 15 or 20 years in Poona in more than one judicial capacity, and he was sorry to say that the hon. member had been a Judge of the High Court for a time, in which position he was not confirmed. He mentioned this to show why he regarded the blunders which had been made by the hon. member as perfectly inexcusable. When Mr. Gokhale had told his tale, he was challenged to prove his assertions, and there were men who knew India and its Government, and the character of the English officials, and who refused to believe these assertions. Thereupon the hon. member for Banffshire came forward with a testimony as to Mr. Gokhale's character. He said that he had known him for years, and that he knew him to bear the highest character for integrity. When a responsible member of Parliament undertook to give such a certificate, and in such circumstances, he ought to be more careful. (Cheers.) In his confession to the Government of Bombay, this Mr. Gokhale said:—Private letters confirmed my opinion, and the circumstances which followed the murders left no doubt in my mind that punishment swift and terrible was descending upon that unhappy city, and the brand of general disloyalty was being placed on the brow of my race. That was the explanation. Mr. Gokhale was afraid that punishment would follow these murders, and in order to avoid it he made all these statements without believing them. Since it had been known that the Government were going to adopt certain proceedings in consequence of the murders of Mr. Rand, and Lieutenant Ayet, he

the hon. member for Banffshire had begun to bombard the Secretary of State for India with questions. The hon. member was not troubled on account of the murders of his fellow-countrymen—(cheers); he was not agitated on account of the sorrowing parents who had been bereaved of their sons in a far-off land. No; all the hon. member's tenderness, apprehension, and anxiety were aroused, not for the relatives of the victims of this dastardly crime, but lest the Government of India should take any measures which would insure the punishment of the offenders, and the prevention of such crimes in future. (Cheers.) Was any of the testimony for which the hon. member for Banffshire vouch reliable. (Cries of "Oh!" and hear, hear!) The hon. member had taken advantage of his position in that great chamber. (Laughter, and cries of "Order!")

The SPEAKER said that the hon. member would be in order in replying to what the hon. member for Banffshire had said with regard to the outrages, but he had no right to make this an opportunity for entering upon matters which were merely personal to the hon. baronet.

Sir M. BROWNAGGER contended that the hon. member's apology to that House did not wipe away the great error committed by him in putting such blind reliance upon the statements of a man who had confessed that he had perjured himself. (Cries of "Oh!" and cheers.)

Sir W. WEDDERBURN rose to make an explanation. Professor Gokhale being here as a witness before the Royal Commission, he thought it right to give members an opportunity of hearing what a gentleman who had recently come from Poona had to say. Professor Gokhale came here accredited by a large number of his fellow-countrymen, and he still maintained that he was a gentleman bearing the highest character for integrity. Professor Gokhale made a great mistake in allowing himself to be misled by his correspondents. He did not say that he had any knowledge of these alleged facts himself. He (Sir W. Wedderburn) had never said that he believed them. (Cries of "Oh!") All he had done was to give this gentleman an opportunity of stating his views.

Sir M. BROWNAGGER denied that Professor Gokhale was sent to this country as the representative of a large number of people, and asked why the names of the professor's correspondents were withheld. He was not entitled to keep their names up his sleeve. (Laughter.) As long as these letters were not forthcoming they were entitled to believe that they were merely fictitious. (Hear, hear.) There had been forged memorials and signatures, and those letters might be forgeries also. He had now done with the hon. baronet—(hear, hear)—and he turned to the subject of the amendment that stood in his name. He could not at that hour venture to trouble the House with the statistics and arguments in support of it. Nor was it necessary for him to do so, after the remarks of the noble lord in favour of greater attention being directed in future to industrial education. There were thirty-seven millions of manufactured imports into India as against four millions of manufactured exports, barring cotton and jute fabrics. The Government fifty years ago established a system of education which it was hoped would fit the people to proceed in the path of progress and prosperity by enabling them to develop the material resources lying at their own doors. But experience had shown that those expectations were mistaken. That system of education, established by Sir Charles Wood, had driven the people into the learned professions, which were immensely overstocked, while the smallest articles of daily use and consumption were supplied by foreign countries. The time had, therefore, come when the Government of India must take some action in order to develop that industrial prosperity of which India stood so much in need. In view of the seditious teaching of the vernacular press, the Government of India were also bound to investigate how that press was conducted, what were the qualifications and capabilities of those who conducted it, and why it was to a large extent turned into an instrument of sedition, blackmailing, and intimidation. (Hear, hear.) There were, no doubt, a number of papers which were conducted ably and in a spirit of loyalty, like the *Rust Guffar*, the *Indian Spectator*, the *Hindu Patriot*, the *Moslem Chronicle*, and others: but they were very few compared to the large bulk of low journals which were in the hands of ignorant men and others who bore no goodwill to their rulers. He hoped, in conclusion, that the Secretary of State and his colleagues would strengthen the hands of the

Viceroy and other administrators of our Indian Empire to enable them to deal with the difficulties that had arisen there with firmness; and that the House would give them all that support which they needed for overcoming those obstacles he had indicated as tending to hinder the progress of her contented and docile people towards the development which it was the great aim of British rule to secure to them. (Cheers.)

SIR A. SCOBLE.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE said he found himself unable to agree with any of the resolutions which had been placed on the Paper in regard to India; and the speeches which had been delivered went more in the direction of offering advice to the Government of India, which they did not require, than of making any practical suggestions. There could be no doubt that this Jubilee year had been fraught with disaster to India. Some of these disasters were the act of God. Famine and pestilence could not be prevented by human wisdom, though human wisdom might do and had done most effectual work in diminishing their ravages. (Hear, hear.) The frontier expeditions now on foot were in the ordinary day's work of the Government of India, and there was no need to dwell upon them, except to say that the British people appreciated the loyalty and devotion of the Indian troops and the rapidity and energy with which the Government had met the sudden calls made upon them. (Hear, hear.) He desired to associate himself with the praise bestowed by the Secretary of State on the Viceroy, who had shown a readiness and resource, a courage and a promptitude which entitled him to the respect, admiration, and gratitude of every British subject. (Hear, hear.) He regretted very much the attacks that had been made on the British soldiers engaged in the task of arresting the plague. There was no doubt from the evidence received that they had discharged their duty with the utmost patience, mercy and kindness. (Hear, hear.) And there was no ground whatever for saying that any British soldier had misconducted himself. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the case mentioned on the other side of the House, the persons concerned were not British soldiers. One was an inferior police officer, and one in an inferior grade of the medical service. His hon. friend the member for Flintshire, whose benevolence everyone recognised, had spoken in warm commendation of the steps taken by the Government to repair the injury done by the famine, and to stamp out the plague. He associated himself with the hon. member's suggestion that it would be a graceful and desirable thing if the Government of this country were to come to the assistance of the Government of India by a substantial money grant. The famine was not anywhere near at an end, and its after effects had to be dealt with, and he would like very much to see a handsome sum placed at the disposal of the Government of India for the purchase of seed and cattle, in order to enable the cultivators of the land to plough and sow their lands. (Hear, hear.) He believed that a grant from this Parliament would have the effect the member for Flintshire anticipated, and would produce an outburst of gratitude from the cultivators of the land which would do much to strengthen British rule in India. The hon. member for Banffshire had urged the Government not to proceed with severity in the presence of circumstances with regard to the disturbances that had taken place. Had there been any severity on the part of the Government? (Hear, hear.) They were told there had been failures in the system of relief given by the Government in famine camps and works. That was the fault of inferior native agencies. Surely that ought not to be charged against the Government. The fact was there was too much anxiety to displace European agency in India. Unfortunately in that country dependence had to be placed on inferior native agencies, which constantly frustrated and brought to naught the benevolent designs of the Government. He had never been in favour of coercive measures against the Press in India, but what was the case? They found that in India newspapers were often established, not to be intelligent organs of public opinion, but to be devoted simply to obtaining blackmail from the more respectable members of their own community. The hon. member had said that the present law was equal to dealing with Press offences. The Government were now going to try. The question was now before the Bombay High Court, and that Court would decide in due course of law. In regard to native industries, no doubt there was a great economical as well as a political revolution going

on in India. The Government was not blind to what was going on. Still, the situation was one which could not be disposed of by legislation. He was sorry that the hon. member for Hoxton intended to raise the old controversy in regard to that form of disease which unhappily had been so prevalent amongst British troops. Statistics recently obtained proved most clearly that the freer the hand given to the Government of India in that matter the better it would be for the morality of the British Army, for the health of the Army, for the people of India, and for the women of England. (Hear, hear.) In 1895, under the pressure of the opinion of this House, an Act was passed restricting the power of the Government of India to make regulations with regard to this form of contagious disease. The Commander-in-Chief, Sir George White, speaking the other day in the Viceroy's Council, supplied the strongest argument for the repeal of that Act, for he said:—"The statistics of 1895 are in themselves irrefutable proof of the necessity of stronger legislation. In that year, out of 68,331 men in cantonments, the admissions into hospital for venereal diseases were no less than 36,681, or 5·369 per 1,000. Of these cases 22,702 were syphilis. The ratio for primary disease has increased 137 per cent. since 1887, and that for secondary disease no less than 188 per cent. in the same period. Secondary syphilis was in 1895 four times more prevalent than it was in 1873." The Royal College of Physicians, who might be taken as an unprejudiced authority, stated in their Report:—"About 13,000 soldiers return to England from India every year, and of these, in 1894, over 60 per cent. had suffered from some form of venereal disease. These figures are quoted as showing more forcibly than words can the risk of contamination, not only to the present population of this country, but also to its future generations. Of these men a number die, or, remaining invalids, are more or less incapacitated from earning their own livelihood, and thus become a burden on the rates." The moral aspects of the question had never been lost sight of by the Government of India. They had carefully desired to give the soldier such employment and recreation as might minimise his temptations, but at the same time a Government which had any regard for the population under its sway ought not to hesitate for a moment to apply what it conceived to be the most effectual remedy for the existing state of things. (Cheers.)

SIR H. H. FOWLER.

Sir HENRY FOWLER said that, whatever difference of opinion there might be as to the number of members present to-night as compared with the occasions of preceding Indian Budget debates, it would be generally agreed that the debate had been unusually lively. But the note to-night had been, he thought, on a minor key, and although there had been no disposition on the part of those who had taken part in the debate to indulge in any unnecessary apprehension, or in anything approaching to panic, there had been expressed a dissatisfaction as to the state of things in India, which, he thought, proceeded, in the main, from misapprehension more than from well-grounded fear. (Hear, hear.) At the onset he wished to say that the statement of the noble lord was not only distinguished by great ability, but couched in appropriate conciliatory and statesmanlike terms. (Cheers.) There was nothing provocative in the noble lord's speech; it was a fair and candid statement as to the difficulties of the Indian Government, and the opposing elements which seemed to have accumulated month after month with increasing force. He might say that from both sides of the House they tendered him their cordial appreciation of the manner in which he had discharged his task—(cheers)—and they also joined with the noble lord in expressing their great admiration of the conduct of the Viceroy. (Cheers.) Those only who, like the Secretary of State, had had weekly communications with Lord Elgin, could fully appreciate those qualities of courage, firmness, wisdom, and level-headedness which Lord Elgin had shown during the whole of his administration; and it must be gratifying to him to know that in this particular crisis he had the confidence, not only of the present Government, but of that which preceded it, and also of the House of Commons. (Cheers.) Of course, this Budget debate centred round the question of famine. This was the famine year, this was the calamity of India, and he thought they had not yet in that debate done full justice to the Indian Government, and to the administration which had been going on since

the famine broke out. Judging from some of the speeches to which they had listened they might be led to suppose that in some way or other the Government of India had been responsible for the famine, and that the economic laws in force in India since the British rule commenced had created a state of things which never existed in India before. But the history of India showed a long succession of famines during a succession of centuries, and although the present was one of the most terrible famines in some of its aspects, yet, nevertheless, the Government of India had dealt with it with unexampled vigour and success. (Hear, hear.) Governments had enough to bear upon their shoulders without attributing blame to them for want of rain, and the cause of the Indian famine was not the Indian Government, the British Government, or British rule in India, but the meteorological result, the symptoms of which the noble lord was aware of when he addressed the House last year. The bad monsoon was the cause of famine, and he thought they might now confidently hope that there would be a good monsoon this year. He would venture to put before the House the protective and administrative means which could and ought to be undertaken to grapple with this terrible calamity, which the Government could not foresee or prevent, but which they might by wise administration possibly mitigate. The House was aware that after the last famine a Famine Commission was appointed, and some of the most competent men who could possibly be selected thoroughly exhausted the whole question of famine protection and prevention. His English friends must excuse him when he said that although the remedies they propounded were no doubt the result of great ability and research he preferred the deliberate judgment of accomplished experts who had been acquainted with India all their lives, and who, with the assistance also of English experts, in that well-known Report recommended to the Government what measures they thought ought to be adopted—recommendations which he thought the events of that year had proved to be correct. Judging from some of the speeches, it might be thought that nothing had been done in regard to irrigation in India, but a great deal had been done before 1877, and a great deal had been done since 1877. The major canals and great works since 1877 had received an extension of 14,000 miles, and an increase of 3½ million of acres in the area of irrigation, at an expense of 130 million of rupees, and the minor canals had received a corresponding extension at a cost of 30 millions. Scarcely less remarkable was the enormous development in that time of well irrigation; wherever there was water and wells could be dug, wells had been dug. But it must be remembered that only one-eleventh of the whole area of India was available for well irrigation. It must also be remembered that if there was to be development in the way of canals the water supply from the river must be tapped at a point where it was sufficient, and it must not be taken at a point where it would create a swamp, or else they would have malaria instead of famine. Irrigation had, on the whole, been an advantageous investment for the Indian Government. The point now was not the desirability of irrigation, but whether the Government had not reached a point when they should proceed by degrees. If the Secretary for India was satisfied on the subject he was sure he would give all the help he could. At present the irrigated area of India was capable of feeding 120,000,000 of the people. Therefore one-half of the population of India was provided for; and these works had been carried out by the much-abused Government of India since 1877. On the subject of railways he entirely sympathised with the views of the Secretary for India with regard to railway stations. In 1877 the country was mapped out into areas of food supply with a railway provision for each block; and, according to the calculation of the Government of India, a line 300 miles long, serving a tract twenty-five miles broad on either side, could protect from famine an area of 15,000 miles, and they drew up a scheme for 20,000 miles of railway. Of this total 9,000 miles were already made, and the mileage constructed between 1877 and April, 1896, was 11,409. One half of this was specifically recommended by the Famine Commission. There were now in India two great protections against famine—increased irrigation and improved railway communication. As to the administrative mechanism by which the Government brought to bear all its resources to deal with famine, it had been justly remarked in the press that the famine code constructed by the Commission of 1877 was scarcely less perfect than the code on board a P. and O. steamer in case of an out-

break of fire. One of the things hon. members should consider who advocated interference with the existing land tenure of India was that the Government was the great landlord in India, and in the present Estimates it would be found that the Secretary for India had had to make large deductions for allowances the Government had made to their tenants for rent which would never be collected or paid. The Government had, moreover, made large advances to enable irrigation works to be carried out. Respecting the remarks of the hon. member for Flintshire, no one would minimise the suffering that prevailed in India. Suffering was inseparable from famine, but the recent suffering was a very small part of the suffering that existed in 1877, or that would have existed if the protective works had not been constructed. As he understood the Secretary for India, there was a subsistence allowance to every man, woman, and child who went on the relief works. Could our own poor relief do more than that? When we had a government grappling in this way with a great difficulty, they deserved, not adverse criticism, but all the help that could be given to them. (Ministerial cheers.) The hon. member for Donegal, referring to the Famine Relief Fund, informed the House that large sums of money had been diverted from the purposes of the relief of famine, and that the Indian Government were not in possession of the funds they ought to be in order to meet the famine emergency. If the hon. member had read the statement of the noble lord opposite he would see that in the seventeen years in which the famine fund had been in existence £24,215,000 had been raised for the purposes of that fund, appropriated out of revenue; that £6,000,000 had been given away in relief; that £13,000,000 had been spent on protective works—which he thought were an admirable famine insurance fund—and last of all that the balance of between five and six millions had been applied in payment of debt. Therefore, at the present moment the Government of India had paid off debt, out of this famine fund, of nearly £6,000,000. (Hear, hear.) That meant that they might go into the market to-morrow and borrow £6,000,000 which might be necessary to make up any deficit of the last two years, and yet the financial position of India would not be one whit the worse than it otherwise would have been. (Cheers.) It would have been a silly financial operation to have accumulated £6,000,000 in gold and kept it locked up in Calcutta or Bombay, but what the Government did was to pay off debt with it, which was then carrying 4 and 4½ per cent. interest, get rid of that interest and charge, and now, if they wanted it, they could borrow that amount at 2½ per cent. interest. (Cheers.) He was glad to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer present, as he wished to allude to a question—namely, that of an Imperial contribution to the revenue of India out of the Imperial funds in connection with this great calamity. His hon. friend behind him had pointed out what they all knew—the great wealth of this country and the poverty of India. He was not at present going to trouble the House with any arguments of his own, as he was quite sure they were familiar to the minds of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his colleagues; but he wanted to call the attention of the House to the speech of one of the greatest landowners in India, a most loyal and distinguished subject of the Queen, the Maharaja of Darbhanga, than whom no one could speak with greater authority on a question like this in the Indian Government. He said:—“Our financial prospect being what it is, and the imposition of further taxes being impossible, I think we may appeal with some confidence for a subsidy for the Home Government. I make this appeal not only as a matter of favour, but also as an act of justice.” The Maharaja proceeded to argue the question now under the consideration of a Royal Commission with reference to the military expenditure of India, and he also referred to the controversy, happily over, which related to the charges for the Indian troops last year. Having disposed of these questions, he used these words:—“So long the burden has been exclusively borne by the Indian taxpayer. In time of his need he may, therefore, fairly appeal to the Home Government for a subsidy, and I am sure he will not appeal in vain to the generous English nation; for his demand is based on considerations of justice and equity. For England in the past he has made at least some pecuniary sacrifices, and to the English Government he may appeal for help in a time of pestilence and famine. I trust your lordship's Government will see their way to press this view of the matter upon the attention of Her Majesty's ministers in England. The whole of India feels deeply grateful for the magnificent

way in which the people of England have unanimously come forward to afford relief to the famine stricken peasantry of this country in a year like this. What I now request is that the English Government should supplement the good work that has been performed by the generous English public. Any concession of this sort, in a year like this, will, I feel sure, not only be regarded with feelings of the deepest gratitude by the thinking portion of the Indian public, but, what is more, it must go a long way to bind down the two nations in closer bonds of union and love.” (Cheers.) Those were the sentiments of one of the most distinguished subjects of the Queen in India, and one whose words, he believed, would have weight with the Government. (Cheers.) With reference to the plague, he thought the Government were quite right to stamp it out at all costs. No risks that they could run could outweigh the terrible danger which would have accrued to India—to her commerce and to her prosperity—if that plague had been allowed to go on unchecked. (Cheers.) There had been a controversy as to what Lord Sandhurst called “ridiculous, ruthless, and heartless charges.” He knew Lord Sandhurst well enough to say he would not believe such charges until they were proved up to the hilt and by evidence beyond dispute. (Cheers.) He would not take hearsay slander against Lord Sandhurst or the Government of India. (Cheers.) The whole case broke down, and by a concurrence of testimony which was conclusive, it had been shown that there had been the greatest consideration and the greatest delicacy manifested by the whole of the officials; that they had the assistance of ladies, of medical men, of English officers, and of English soldiers. (Cheers.) He had no sympathy with those slighting remarks which had been made on the English soldiers, and he did not understand, coming from some gentlemen who were specially representative, as he was himself, of the working man, why these slights should be cast upon them, because the English soldier was the English working man, and his experience of the English working man was that he was not in the habit of insulting women in the manner which had been suggested. (Cheers.) He rejoiced that Lord Sandhurst had completely vindicated himself, as his friends knew he would, and with a courage worthy of himself and of his father, one of the most distinguished men in the service of the Government of India, had taken the whole of the responsibility upon his own shoulders, not leaving it to his subordinates. (Hear, hear.) He rejoiced that in a crisis of this sort Lord Sandhurst, with his great knowledge of hospital work in London, had been at the head of the Government of Bombay and—this was a test of his work—had stamped out the plague in Poona. (Cheers.) There was at an earlier period of the evening an Amendment, now disposed of, raising the question of the introduction of the British Constitution into India. (Laughter.) He would only make one remark on this extraordinary proposal, and it would be rather a paradoxical observation. There was no such place as India. India was a geographical term to describe the gathering together, the tying together, under British rule of a vast variety of countries. There was greater difference between the countries which formed the Indian Empire than between the different countries of Europe. (Hear, hear.) A distinguished author on this subject had said “that Scotland was more like Spain than Bengal was like the Punjab.” (Hear, hear.) In India we have fifty different languages—(hear, hear,)—every variety of race—(hear, hear,)—contending religions, every element of hostile collision, longstanding racial prejudices, and the bitterness of religious feuds, and into the midst of these elements the British Constitution was to be introduced. (Laughter.) The consequences of attempting to bring into India a representative body similar to the House of Commons would be anarchy, civil war, the abrogation of British rule, and the return to military despotism. (Hear, hear.) No; the story of India was one this country need not be ashamed of. A great deal of fault might be found with the Government of India, but the story of the Government of India by Great Britain was one of the most wondrous stories in all our history. (Cheers.) There was no parallel to it in the history of our own or other countries. Of course, mistakes had been made; you cannot govern 300 millions of people by human agency without great mistakes. Call them if you like great blunders, but the British Government had taught India and taught Asia what was not known there before—impartial justice and the equality of all creeds and classes before the law. (Cheers.) It had protected the Indian

people, and the people knew that their lives and property were safe. As an Englishman he was prouder of what this country had done in India than what had been done at home. There was no dishonour to us in our rule in India, and he trusted that the Government of India, supported by the House as he knew it was, supported by the people of this country as he knew it was, would go on improving and doing more and more for the people of India. (Cheers.) If his hon. friend would read the history of the progress of India, he would find a great many of his illusions vanish, and he would recognise what the British Government had done for the people of India, and in this year, this terrible year of famine, plague, and earthquake, he would learn that by machinery devised by English statesmen and carried out by English civil and military officers, work had been done of which England has every reason to be proud. (Cheers.) He could not allow the Session to close with a Debate such as this without uttering some words of encouragement to our Indian officers, and without a word of protest against expressions of doubt, depression, and dismay. We had had difficulties to contend with, and we had met them with courage, teaching the Indian people how to surmount such difficulties, and though a year of supreme disaster had been this Jubilee for India, yet he hoped it would leave a story of which England and India might both be proud. (Cheers.)

MR. JAMES STUART.

MR. JAMES STUART said the brief remarks with which he would trouble the House at this late hour would be in the nature of a reply to the hon. member on the other side of the House who very erroneously anticipated the character of the speech he was about to make. In the first place, the hon. member fell into the mistake—a common mistake—in respect to what the Indian Government had done. When the Secretary of State sent his despatch to India, it would be remembered he requested regulations to be made for bringing the special diseases referred to under the same regulations as other diseases, and he laid down certain restrictions which he was insistent, and rightly and honourably so, that the Indian Government should obey. He, for one, abstained from bringing this subject forward in the House at that time because his belief that the restrictions would disappear was a matter of suspicion. He believed it because precisely the same order, accompanied by precisely the same restrictions, had been given by Lord Cross eight years ago. It would be observed that in the correspondence laid on the Table of the House the Government of India said it was their intention to repeal the Cantonment Act of 1895, but there was no statement and no quotation given as to what that Cantonment Act provided. When that statement was made, even the best-informed organs of public opinion in this country made a mistake as to what that Act contained. He would quote only one, *The Lancet*, which said: A Bill has been introduced into the Viceroyal Legislative Council repealing the Cantonment Acts of 1895, and untying the hands of the Indian Government by giving it the same powers in respect of venereal disease that it has in the case of other infectious and contagious disorders. *The Times*, in a leading article, went further, and said that the action of the Indian Government was simply empowering the bringing of person affected with the disease under the same regulations as persons affected with cholera, small-pox, etc. Had that been the only effect of repealing the Act, he should not have brought the question forward at the present time. That Act was a very short one. It consisted of one clause, and that clause of three lines. Here was the whole Act: "Provided that no such rule shall contain any regulation enjoining or permitting any compulsory or periodical examination of any woman by medical officers or others for the purpose of ascertaining whether she is or is not suffering from any venereal disease or is not fit for prostitution, or any regulation for the licensing or special registration of prostitutes, or giving legal sanction to the practice of prostitution in any cantonment." That Act did not hinder the treatment of venereal diseases similar to any other disease. It simply prohibited the practice which the Secretary of State ordered should not be carried out. Here was what the Secretary of State said in his Despatch: "There must be nothing which can be represented as an encouragement to vice; there must be no registration of prostitutes other than that which is, or should be, enforced for all the inhabitants of the cantonment; no granting of licences to practise prostitution, and there must be no compulsory and

periodical examination of women." He wanted to know whether the Government, who were responsible to this House for the action of the Indian Government, approved or disapproved of the repeal of the Act? If they disapproved they were bound to prevent its repeal; if they approved, what became of the restrictions? Did the Government or did they not approve or disapprove of the action which he had stated? He did not want to bring forward any moral argument; he wished to appeal to plain matter of fact. The hon. gentleman opposite argued in favour of the practical re-establishment of the same system which had been so utterly and hopelessly a failure. He spoke of the increase of disease in the Indian Army since 1873 until now. There had been a great increase but it took place while the regulations it was proposed to re-establish existed just as much as since the regulations had been taken away. It had not been stated, moreover, with reference to the increase before their repeal, and during their existence, and also since the repeal of the regulations that in the home Army disease had largely diminished. If they looked through the various stations in India also, and the various regiments in India, they would find as between station and station, whether the regulation existed or not, and between regiment and regiment, there were far greater differences than existed under the regulation system. In one station there was frequently, whether regulation or not, three and four times the amount of disease that there was in another station. There was, for example, 50 per cent. more disease in the Bengal command than there was in the Punjab command. One of the reasons why he objected to the re-imposition of these regulations was that they had failed—as the Army Sanitary Commission had for twenty years repeatedly shown—to accomplish the end they were designed to accomplish. The extraordinary difference between station and station and between regiment and regiment to which he had referred, gave the key partly to the position and character of the proposals which he and others had already laid before the Secretary of State. No one recognised more than they the virtue of medical treatment. But they said that to effectually deal with this matter it was necessary to strike at the vice which caused the disease; they must amend the scandalous environment into which, to their disgrace, they had plunged young soldiers in India, and that environment was intensified in its present unfortunate position by the existence of such regulation as had been re-imposed—in saying which he said no more than had been reported for many years by the Army Sanitary Commission. His object had been a simple one—to make this one point clear; that the Indian Government had made a giant stride; that there had arisen a new situation, a situation created by—though he believed it was not intended or contemplated in—the Secretary of State's Despatch; and that the repeal in India of the Act of 1895 was a warning to those in this country who desired to prevent a repetition of the abuses which shocked the whole nation in 1888 and to those who regarded the provisions which were prevented by the Act of 1895 as profoundly immoral, and their enforcement as a huge national mistake. (Hear, hear.)

LORD G. HAMILTON.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said he had no right to speak except by the leave of the House, but as the hon. gentleman had made a personal appeal to him in reference to the action of the Indian Government, the House would perhaps allow him to answer the hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.) He could do so in two or three minutes. He did not propose to go into every matter raised by the hon. gentleman. Whether or not the Government were wise in endeavouring to take measures in order to stop the terrible growth of this disease, he was quite content that their action should be challenged, and condemned if they did not bring conclusive evidence to justify it. But he adhered to everything in his despatch. He thought the hon. gentleman and his friends had not accurately grasped what the intention of the Indian Government was in repealing the Act of 1895. That Act was passed after the home authorities had declined to allow the Indian Government to treat venereal disease as a contagious disease. Since then, however, it had been decided to apply to it all such regulations as were applicable to contagious diseases; therefore the House could understand that an Act which was passed to carry out one state of things was not applicable to exactly the reverse state of things. While preparing the despatch which he wrote to the Indian Government, it was not clear to him that the phraseology of

the Act of 1895 was such as to prevent the regulations that were proposed. But the Indian Government in their reply showed that if the Act was not repealed the medical officers would not be able to carry out the regulations they had submitted for approval. Those regulations were entirely in accord with his despatch, and did not go an inch beyond it, and as the Indian Government wished to repeal the Act he gave his consent. But if the hon. gentleman thought they were going to take any action that was inconsistent with the despatch, he was in error. All they wanted was to give the regulations fair play by removing from the Indian statute book an enactment which did not allow of the proper and effectual operation of these new regulations. (Hear, hear.)

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS had given notice of his intention to move: "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in future no Indian prince or chief shall be deposed on the ground of maladministration or misconduct until the fact of such maladministration or misconduct shall have been established to the satisfaction of a public tribunal which shall command the confidence alike of the Government and of the princes and chiefs of India." He said he would not attempt to deal with the subject at such an hour. But he was sure that the establishment of some such court was really needed. If such an independent tribunal were set up it would result not in a loss, but in a gain to the moral power of the British Government.

MR. R. J. PRIOR.

Mr. R. J. PRIOR who had a notice on the Paper to move: "That, in the opinion of this House, the present famine has shown that there is a necessity for further means of transport in India, and that special attention should be given to the subject of irrigation and to the construction of waterways in suitable districts," said that the battering which he had endured from his right hon. friend the member for East Wolverhampton and from the Secretary of State for India had been meted out under a misapprehension. The motion of which he had given notice was drawn in accordance with a memorial to the noble lord in favour of increased irrigation, and signed by hon. members on both sides of the House. Neither memorial nor motion implied any censure on the Government of India. The view of those who signed the memorial was that if the food which existed in India could have been carried to the famine districts, there would have been no famine. He heartily approved of the system of railways so ably carried on by the Indian Government, but side by side with that system should come a system of irrigation. No doubt most of the more obvious and necessary works had already been carried out. But his right hon. friend the member for East Wolverhampton had said that in his opinion irrigation works ought to pay some rate of interest on the invested capital. Interest was desirable, but it was not the only advantage resulting from irrigation works. They gave an increased land revenue, and were an insurance against famine. He had an important letter on this point from Mr. J. A. Bourdillon, Commissioner of the Patna Division, Bengal. The letter was written in January, and without any idea of this debate: "The Kharif (autumn) season of 1896 has been one of extreme pressure on the Sone Canals. The average rainfall from August to October is 23 inches, but in 1896 it was only 11 inches in the area commanded by the Sone Canals. From July 21 to August 21 showers scarce—quite useless for the busiest transplanting time. It was only in the irrigated tracts that any transplanting till after August 21 could be carried on. The Kharif crops are sown in July and August. From July 21 to August 31 demand from the Sone Canals was very great. Area actually irrigated in the past Kharif season, 312,000 acres, exceeding the previous maximum by 32,000 acres. The rice crop, worth 30 to 40 rupees per acre in ordinary years, is this year (1896) worth more than 50 rupees. Crop saved by the Sone Canal is worth some 150 lakhs of rupees to the rayats, and probably more. The entire cost of constructing the Sone Canals was 270 lakhs of rupees. Pressure of Kharif season is past. Now the demand is for the rabi (winter) crop. In 1873-74 there was scarcity in Behar—no canals there. Compare 1896-97 with 1873-74, and see the difference the canals make. This year 312,000 acres of crops matured by Sone Canals for the Kharif season will place 60 lakhs of

maunds of 'paddy' (unhusked rice), equal to 40 lakhs of maunds of cleaned rice in the hands of the people. If there is a failure of the rabi crop (winters) the Sone Canals are expected to mature 260,000 acres of rabi, which may add 25 lakhs of maunds to the food supply of Behar. The canals will thus add 65 lakhs* of maunds of food for the people, and save thousands of lives before the end of March, 1897. Sixty-five lakhs of maunds equals 320,000,000 lbs., or 11,428,000 quarters. One lakh equals 100,000. One maund equals 40 seers; one seer equals 2 lbs." He and those who shared his views wanted to make sure that the Indian Government would keep a very watchful eye on this important question. The Indian Government were doing well with the railway problem, and he hoped they were not neglecting the irrigation problem.

MR. J. G. WEIR.

Mr. WEIR regretted that the consideration of Indian questions had been deferred until the very last hours of the Session. He supported the demand of the hon. member for Banffshire for a village enquiry into the causes which blight the industry of the cultivators. That was a fair and reasonable request. It would be a very simple enquiry and a very inexpensive one, for it would be made not by the high officials of India, but in the villages among the people. He would point out that the rents of the cultivators had been raised five, six, and even ten times. What class of people could stand that? Rack renting had been tried in Ireland and in the Highlands of Scotland, with the result that the Government had to bring in measures to stop it. Why did not the Government adopt similar measures in regard to India? Instead of that, the Government in India collected taxes and rents from the cultivators at the time they were least able to meet those demands—viz., just before the harvest was gathered in. That was a monstrous system. The result of it was that the unfortunate rayat got into the grip of the money-lenders—

The SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member is merely repeating the arguments and phrases which have already been used by the hon. member for Banffshire. That is irregular.

Mr. WEIR said he desired to call attention to the importance of irrigation. This was a question of very serious importance to the people of India. It had been brought forward by several members of the House that night, and it could not be pressed home too closely. He would ask the Government whether in this Jubilee year they would not consider whether they could place at the disposal of the Government of India such a sum as would enable the Government of India to carry out works which would prevent these famines.

The SPEAKER drew the attention of the House to the continued repetition of his own arguments and of those of other members by Mr. Weir, member for Rose and Cromarty, and directed him to discontinue his speech.

The following Resolution was thereupon agreed to by the Committee and reported to the House:—

Resolved, That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the Total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1896, was Rs. 98,370,167; that the Total Expenditure in India and in England charged against the Revenue was Rs. 96,836,169; that there was a Surplus of Revenue over Expenditure of Rs. 1,533,998; and that the Capital Outlay on Railways and Irrigation Works was Rs. 4,087,194.

August 6.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH. THE "JUBILEE," THE FAMINE AND THE PLAGUE.

The LORD CHANCELLOR read the Queen's speech which contained the following references to India.

"The presence of the Representatives of the Colonies and of the Indian Empire at the ceremonies held in celebrations of

* This yield equals half the quantity imported by Government in 1873-74, which was known to be too much for the need of the time.

SEPTEMBER, 1897.]

INDIA IN PARLIAMENT

the sixtieth year of my reign has contributed to strengthen the bond of union between all parts of my Empire, and an additional proof of the attachment of the Colonies to the Mother Country has been furnished by the fiscal legislation of Canada, and by the contribution which the Cape Colony, following the example of Australasia, has offered to our naval defence.

"The famine which, to my profound grief, has prevailed throughout large portions of my Indian dominions since the autumn of last year has taxed severely the resources of that country. I gladly acknowledge the energy and self-sacrifice of my officers of all ranks, both Europeans and natives, and of many private persons, who, with untiring zeal, and with an anxious desire to avoid offence to native feeling, have laboured to save life and to relieve suffering. An appeal to the sympathy of my subjects in all parts of my Empire has been responded to in a most generous manner, and I rejoice to learn that, owing to a satisfactory rainfall, there is now every prospect that the area of distress will be very greatly diminished.

"The Plague, which caused a large number of deaths in certain districts in India during the earlier part of the year, has now almost disappeared. This improvement is mainly due to the energetic and judicious steps which were taken by the Local Governments to prevent it from spreading. Every pre-

caution will be adopted in view of the possibility of recurrence, but at present there is a steady decrease in prevalence and in its fatal effects."

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SURRENDER OF FUGITIVE SLAVES.

Mr. THOMAS BAYLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether there existed treaties between her Majesty's Government and Arab chiefs, such as the Sultan of Lahaj, under which we undertook to surrender fugitive slaves:

Whether the practice of surrender of fugitive slaves also continued at Muscat:

And, whether, in the event of the practice not being known at the India Office enquiry would be made.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not aware of any treaties of the character described in the first question. I do not know to what the hon. member refers in the second question. Certain difficulties have arisen in dealing with the slave traffic in certain harbours of the Sultan of Muscat and in the Persian Gulf, and on this subject I am in correspondence with the Government of India.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

[LONDON: STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICE: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.]

VOL. VIII.

Special Supplement issued Gratis.

DECEMBER, 1897.

THE PRESS PROSECUTIONS IN INDIA.

MR. TILAK'S APPLICATION TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

ARGUMENT BY MR. H. H. ASQUITH, Q.C., M.P.

THE APPLICATION REFUSED.

FULL REPORT.

On Friday, November 19, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, sitting at Whitehall, heard the petition of Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak for special leave to appeal against the sentence passed upon him by the High Court of Bombay for inciting to disaffection. The members present were the Lord Chancellor, Lord Hobhouse, Lord Davey, and Sir Richard Couch. Mr. Tilak's petition set forth that at the time of the proceedings he was editor, proprietor, and publisher of a weekly journal at Poona called the *Kesari*, which was issued in the Marathi language, and mentioned that he had been selected by the native community to represent them in the Council of the Governor of Bombay, a nomination confirmed by the Governor. On September 8, he was placed on his trial before the High Court of Bombay on two charges under section 124A of the Penal Code for inciting and attempting to incite to disaffection, and the jury, by a majority of six to three, found him guilty, and he was sentenced to eighteen months' rigorous imprisonment. On September 18, he applied to the High Court of Bombay, for leave to appeal to her Majesty in Council, but the Court refused application. He now submitted that the verdict and sentence pronounced by the Court were wrong in law and should be set aside, and asked that the Queen in Council would grant him special leave to appeal against the conviction.

Mr. H. H. Asquith, Q.C., M.P., Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Mr. J. D. Mayne and Mr. G. A. Blair, (instructed by Messrs. Payne and Latter) appeared for the Petitioner. Mr. Arthur Cohen, Q.C., (with him Mr. J. H. A. Branson,) instructed by Mr. Arthur Wilson, represented the Secretary of State for India.

Mr. Asquith, in opening the case, said: The Petitioner was charged with an offence under Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code, which I will read in a moment, and after the trial which lasted some days before Mr. Justice Strachey, and a jury of nine, he was on September 14 last found guilty by a majority I think of three, and sentenced to eighteen months' rigorous imprisonment. The section under which the proceedings were taken was Section 124A and I should say a section which is not found in the Code in the shape in which the Code was passed in 1860, but was introduced into it by an Act No. 27 dated 1873.

SECTION 124A AND THE EXPLANATION.

The Section is in these words:

"Whoever by words, either spoken or intended to be read,

or by signs or by visible representation or otherwise, excites or attempts to excite feelings of disaffection to the Government established by law in British India, shall be punished with transportation for life or for any term, to which fine may be added, or with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years, to which fine may be added, or with fine."

Then follows an "Explanation" in these words:—

"Such a disapprobation of the measures of the Government is as compatible with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government, and to support the lawful authority of the Government against unlawful attempts to subvert or resist that authority, is not disaffection. Therefore the making of comments on the measures of the Government with the intention of exciting only this species of disapprobation is not an offence within this Clause."

Under that section the Petitioner was charged on two counts, first of all with exciting feelings of disaffection, and secondly with attempting to excite feelings of disaffection; and the words of the section which, your Lordships will observe, apply to words spoken or attempted to be read, and the words relied upon in support of these charges, are to be found in two articles published in the issue of the 15th of June, of a newspaper called the *Kesari*—a newspaper published at Poona, in the Marathi language, of which Mr. Tilak the petitioner, is admittedly the proprietor and editor.

THE INCrimINATED ARTICLES.

I think it would be convenient if I at once ask your Lordships to look at those articles which formed the subject matter of the charge, because I may say that the substantial ground on which this application is rested is, that the learned judge in summing up, having to direct the jury as to the meaning of the section which I have read, and its application to the matter before them, misdirected them in an important respect. There are two articles relied upon. I should say that these articles were in the Marathi language, and we have two translations of them, a literal translation and what is called a "free" translation, and the originals also. The first article is—describing it roughly—a report of proceedings which had taken place in connexion with a celebration of Shivaji, who is one of the heroes of the Mahratta race, and is regarded as the founder of their power. It is necessary to mention, in order to explain some of the references in both articles in question, that it appears that there has been of late years a revival of the memory of Shivaji, some correspondences having taken place some years ago in reference to the neglect and disrepair of his tomb, which led to a public movement for putting the tomb in proper order. That, in turn, seems to have aroused considerable interest in the details of his history, which became the subject of correspondence in the Indian newspapers, and in the last two or three years it has become the custom in this part of India to hold celebrations on certain anniversaries in connexion with Shivaji's life, namely, the anniversaries of his birth and of his coronation. The proceedings here reported took place at one of these celebrations, I think on the anniversary of his coronation. It appears that the people of Poona came together to celebrate this on the 12th

MR. TILAK'S APPLICATION BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL

among those who took part in the proceedings
petitioner, Tilak. Two other gentlemen also
was Professor Bhanu, and the other was
vale. They are important here as their
addresses. Part of the matter incriminated. We have not
got the original of the passage in the report which is incrimi-
nated. We have simply got a translation. It begins at the
conclusion of a lecture. Perhaps I ought to add, by way of
explanation, in order to make clear what this refers to, that
one of the incidents in the life of Shivaji which has excited the
greatest amount of controversy is the circumstances under
which he put to death one, Afzul Khan, an emissary of the
Muhammadian ruler of Vijaypur. One set of controversialists
maintain that Shivaji deceived him, under the pretence that he
was about to surrender himself, into his tent and murdered
him; and the other set contend that it was an act of self-
defence, or that Shivaji was provoked. After a lecture had
been delivered on this subject by Professor Bhanu,

"At the conclusion of the lecture Professor Bhanu said: Every Hindu, every Maratha, to whatever party he may belong, must rejoice at this (Shivaji) festival. We are all striving to regain (our) lost independence."

I ought to pause on that word "independence." There is some doubt, as appears from the proceedings at the trial, as to what is the exact English equivalent of the Marathi word used, which is translated here "independence." One of the witnesses being asked what the word "Swatantrya" really means, said that "awa" means "own" and "tantrya" means "control." It would seem, therefore, that they were under the control of some others. It goes on to say that Mill's essay on Liberty might be translated as "Swatantrya." I understand that that would be regarded as a type of what is meant by the word, "so again in freedom of thought, or opinion, or speech or freedom of discussion, liberty of the press, freedom of will, freedom of action," and so on. That is the word which is here translated "independence." (Continuing to read.)

“We are all striving to regain (our) lost independence, and this terrible load is to be uplifted by us all in combination. It will never be proper to place obstacles in the way of any person who, with a true mind follows the path of uplifting this burden in the manner he deems fit. Our mutual dissensions impede our progress greatly. If anyone be crushing down the country from above, cut him off, but do not put impediments in the way of others. Let by-gones be by-gones; let us forget them and forgive one another for them. Have we not had enough of that strife, which would have the same value in the estimation of great men as a fight among rats and cats? All occasions like the present festival which (tend to) unite the whole country must be welcome.”

This explains the allusion here to mutual dissensions and the necessity of what he calls unity. It appears in the evidence that there were in Poona at this time, among what may be called the popular party of the place, two factions or sections, one of them which is called the "orthodox" section (of which the leader was Mr. Tilak, the present petitioner), and the other the "reform," or more advanced section, of which this Professor Bhanu was himself a member. These two sections were in the habit of carrying on controversies; the one with the other, and it was, apparently, in reference to that that he makes this appeal on an occasion like the present festival that they should all unite. Afterwards the other, Professor Jinsavale, said :

“If no one blames Napoleon for committing two thousand murders in Europe; (and) if Cæsar is considered merciful, though he needlessly committed slaughter in Gaul (i.e. France) many a time, why should so virulent an attack be made on Shivaji Maharaja for killing one or two persons? The people who took part in the French Revolution denied that they committed murders, and maintained that they were (only) removing thorns from (their) path; why should not the same principle (? argument) be made applicable to Maharashtra? Being inflamed with partisanship, it is not that we should keep aside our true opinions. It is true that we must (i.e., should not hesitate to) swallow down our opinions on any occasion when an expression of them might be thought detrimental to the interests of the country.” e

The Professor---

"concluded his speech by expressing a hope that next year

there will be witnessed greater unity amongst the various parties in Poona on the occasion of this festival."

Your lordships will observe the allusions there to Caesar and the French Revolution, and it is reasonably plain from the context that the subject he is alluding to is this controversy, whether or not a man like Shivaji would be justified in taking the law into his own hands, and putting a man to death as he did. After the conclusion of this speech Mr. Tliak commenced his discourse :

“It was needless to make fresh historical researches in connexion with the killing of Afzul Khan. Let us even assume that Shivaji first planned and then executed the murder of Afzul Khan. Was this act of Shivaji good or bad? This question which has to be considered should not be viewed from the standpoint of the Penal Code, or even the Smritis of Manu or Yagnavalkya, or even the principles of morality laid down in the Western and Eastern ethical systems. The laws which bind society are for common men like yourself and myself. No one seeks to trace the genealogy of a Rishi, nor to fasten guilt upon a king. Great men are above the common principles of morality. These principles fail in their scope to reach the pedestal of great men. Did Shivaji commit a sin in killing Afzul Khan, or how? The answer to this question can be found in the Mahabharat itself. Shrimat Krishna's advice (teaching) in the Geeta is to kill even our teachers (and) our kinsmen. No blame attaches (to any person) if (he) is doing deeds without being actuated by a desire to reap the fruit (of his deeds). Shri Shivaji Maharájá did nothing with a view to fill the small void of his own stomach (i.e., from interested motives). With benevolent intentions he murdered Afzul Khan for the good of others. If thieves enter our house and we have not (sufficient) strength in our wrists to drive them out, we should, without hesitation, slay them up and burn (them) alive. God has not conferred upon the Mlechhas—[Your lordships will observe a note here that that is “The generic term for a barbarian or foreigner, i.e., for one speaking any language but Sanscrit and not subject to the usual Hindu institutions”]—“the grant, inscribed on a copper plate, of the kingdom of Hindustan. The Maharájá strove to drive them away from the land of his birth; he did not thereby commit the sin of coveting what belonged to others. Do not circumscribe your vision like a frog in a well; get out of the Penal Code, enter into the extremely high atmosphere of the Shrimat Bhagvadgeeta, and then consider the actions of great men.”

In point of fact a different standard of morality is to apply in judging the actions of Shivaji from the laws that bind society and "common men like you and me." I have already told you that he belonged himself to a different party. He says :

“ A country which (i.e., a people who) cannot unite even on a few occasions should never hope to prosper. Bickerings about religious and social matters are bound to go on until death ; but it is most desirable that on one day out of the 365 we should unite at least in respect of one matter. To be one in connexion with Shivaji does not mean that we are completely to forget our other opinions. For quarrelling there are the other days, of course. We should not forget that Ram and Ravan felt no difficulty whatever to meet in the same temple on the occasion of worshipping (the God) Shankar. After the lecture, Pad (verses) of the Sanmitra Samaj and Maharashtra Mela were sung, and this brought the second days' (celebration) to a close.”

That is the first of the two articles relied upon.

NOT EDITORIAL ARTICLES.

Lord Hobhouse: This article is a report.

Mr. ASQUITH: It is a report of proceedings.

Lord Hobhouse. It is not an original article.

Mr. Ashmun, which I saw, which appeared in the article, or the editorial article. I do not think it is the Queen's Jubilee before the close of the celebration of the Queen's Jubilee, and Mr. Tliak, the editor of the paper, published a series of articles, I think three or four, on that subject. It is admitted by the

